EDITORS.

E. Y. MULLINS, D.D., LL.D.,
Editor-in-Chief.

W. J. McGLOTHLIN, Ph.D., D.D.,
Managing Editor.

W. O. CARVER, D.D.,
Review Editor.

A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D.,
Business Manager.

J. R. SAMPEY, D.D., LL.D.
GEO. B. EAGER, D.D., LL.D.
W. O. CARVER, D.D.
C. S. GARDNER, D.D.
B. H. DEMENT, D.D.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS.

REV. B. H. CARROLL, D.D., LL.D., Waco, Texas.
REV. D. F. ESTES, D.D., Hamilton, N. Y.
REV. J. H. FARMER, D.D., LL.D., Toronto, Canada.
REV. A. H. NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D., Waco, Texas.
REV. H. C. VEDDER, D.D., Upland, Pa.
REV. J. P. GREENE, D.D., Liberty, Mo.
REV. W. T. WHITLEY, A.M., Ph.D., Preston, England.

On general matters address Prof. E. Y. Mullins, Editor-in-Chief; with regard to articles and editorial business, address Prof. W. J. McGlothlin, Managing Editor; with regard to books and reviews, address Prof. W. O. Carver, Review Editor; on business matters, address Prof. A. T. Robertson, Business Manager.

337495

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/review-and-expositor_1910-01_7_1

THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. VII January, 1910 No. 1

We take pleasure in presenting to the public the addresses delivered at the Jubilee Celebration of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, September 29 and 30, 1909, prefaced by a brief history of the institution, written by J. R. Sampey, its senior professor. The addresses constitute in the main a review of the history of various departments of theology during the fifty years of this Seminary's existence. The speakers came from various denominations and different parts of the country, and, therefore, collectively present a broad interdenominational view, which we believe will be of general interest. The unusual number of articles explains the absence of all book reviews this quarter. The next number will give double space to book reviews. THE EDITORS.

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

PROFESSOR JOHN R. SAMPEY, D.D., LL.D.

Southern Baptists met in Augusta, Ga., in 1845 and organized the Southern Baptist Convention. At that meeting brethren discussed the question of establishing a general theological seminary for Southern Baptists; but there were difficulties in the way. In many of the states there was already a theological department in connection with the Baptist college. It was impossible at first to persuade brethren representing the different schools to unite in establishing a central theological institution of high order.

The movement in favor of founding a central theological school among Southern Baptists first took root in the states between the Allegheny Mountains and the Mississippi. The Western Baptist Theological Institute at Covington, Ky., was found-

v36

ed for the training of the Baptist ministry in the Northwest and the Southwest. Northern and Southern men united in the establishment of the Institute, and theological students from both sections met in this school located on the banks of the Ohio. When the Southern Baptists organized the Southern Baptist Convention, all the professors in the Covington Theological Institute chose to affiliate with the Northern Baptist missionary societies. They were also agreed in their opposition to the institution of slavery. The trustees of the school fell into two bitterly hostile factions, and there was litigation for the control of the property. The Baptists of the Southwest withdrew their support almost altogether, and began to agitate the question of founding a central theological institution. R. B. C. Howell and J. R. Graves were among the most influential and enthusiastic advocates of a common seminary for the Southwest. The following article, from the pen of Dr. Howell, appeared in the *Tennessee Baptist* in 1847, and was copied by the *Baptist Banner and Western Pioneer,* of Louisville, Ky., in the issue of July 8, 1847:

"We cannot support the Covington school, with its present faculty, another hour. Neither truth, policy nor self-respect will allow it. We, however, must have a theological school. Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas and Missouri form the territory for the proposed institution. It is surely large enough, and needy enough, and rich enough, in both men and money. These States ought to consult together—to have, if possible, a meeting upon the subject, and to determine, as soon as may be, what is to be done, and how and when it is to be done. Brethren, both ministers and laymen, let us hear from you. What say the *Banner and Pioneer,* the *Mississippi Baptist* and the *Southwestern Baptist Chronicle?*"

At a meeting of the Indian Mission Association, held at Nashville, Tenn., in 1847, prominent brethren of Tennessee and Kentucky discussed the question.

Two years later the Southern Baptist Convention met in Nashville. The attendance was small, on account of the presence of cholera in the city, and so the brethren adjourned to

meet on May 23rd of the same year in Charleston, S. C. Rev. B. Manly, Jr., who later became one of the original faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, was present at the meeting in Nashville in May, 1849. In an article published two months before his death, Dr. Manly referred to an incident of this Nashville meeting: "Brethren Howell and J. R. Graves, whom I then met for the first time, were both enthusiastic and zealous for the establishment of the new institution. In fact, they thought the very time had come. Brother Graves was especially earnest in this connection; and I remember when I, a young horse-back preacher from Alabama, without any pastoral charge, in rather frail health, ventured to express a doubt whether matters were ripe for what I agreed was a desirable enterprise, Brother Graves, who was already a skilled and renowned debater, challenged me to a discussion then and there, each to take half an hour at a time, and fight the question out. I declined the wordy conflict, but maintained my opinion. I did not want to be put into the false position of antagonizing the progressive movement for theological education, which I earnestly favored; and I am not ashamed to say I dreaded to cope with so vigorous and able an opponent as Brother Graves in an *ex tempore* debate."

At the adjourned meeting of the Convention in Charleston, a few weeks later, one of the best addresses in favor of a Central Southern Theological Institution was made by B. Manly, Jr. Dr. W. B. Johnson, president of the Southern Baptist Convention, read an elaborate essay on the subject. Some persons have thought that Dr. Johnson was the first to propose the establishment of a general theological school for Southern Baptists; others give this honor to Dr. R. B. C. Howell, or to Dr. J. B. Jeter.

At the Charleston Convention a large committee was appointed to devise ways and means for the improvement of ministerial education in the South; but nothing definite seems to have been done. The chief benefit of this early agitation was the formation of sentiment in favor of such a school.

In June, 1854, the Virginia Baptist General Association invited the friends of theological education to meet at Mont-

gomery, Ala., in connection with the session of the Southern Baptist Convention in May, 1855. Rev. B. Manly, Jr., was secretary of the conference held in the First Baptist church of Montgomery, May 11, 1855. James P. Boyce was an active member of the conference. John A. Broadus was also in attendance upon this meeting. The way was not yet clear for the establishment of a general seminary; but another conference was called to meet in Augusta, Ga., in April, 1856.

Representatives assembled at the appointed time, from the District of Columbia, Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Tennessee, South Carolina and Georgia, the largest attendance coming chiefly from Georgia and South Carolina. Dr. B. Manly, Sr., presided over this convention, as he did over the subsequent meetings in Louisville, Ky., and Greenville, S. C. The difficulties in the way of the establishment of a general theological seminary were still so great that action was deferred for another year. It was recommended that another convention of properly authenticated delegates from the Southern colleges and from Baptist state conventions should be held the following year in Louisville, Ky., during the two days preceding the session of the Southern Baptist Convention. A committee was appointed to collect all the facts concerning existing theological endowments under the control of Southern Baptists. The same committee was requested "to use adequate means for ascertaining what efforts will be made in favor of any location, already occupied or not, by the inhabitants and friends thereof, and what pecuniary subscriptions or pledges will be given as a nucleus, in case such location should be selected for the common institution; the object of all these inquiries being to ascertain, in the fullest manner possible, whether such a demand is felt for a common institution of this kind as may be a basis and encouragement for future united action." Rev. James P. Boyce was author of the report instructing the committee to make these inquiries preparatory to the conference to be held in Louisville, Ky., in May, 1857. Mr. Boyce had already been for one year professor of theology in Furman University, Greenville, S. C. From this time until the opening of the

Seminary in 1859, Rev. James P. Boyce was recognized as the leader in the effort to establish a common theological institution for Southern Baptists. Under the inspiration of his leadership, the South Carolina State Convention, which met at Greenville, on July 26, 1856, proposed to the coming Educational Convention at Louisville to establish at Greenville, S. C., a general theological seminary, offering to raise for this purpose in South Carolina one hundred thousand dollars, on condition that other states should contribute a like amount. It was agreed that the funds for theological purposes in the hands of the trustees of Furman University, amounting to about $30,000, should be included in the South Carolina quota toward the general endowment. It would then be necessary for South Carolina Baptists to raise an additional $70,000.

On July 30, 1856, Prof. Boyce delivered his famous address on "Three Changes in Theological Institutions". Dr. Broadus gives the following summary statement of the three proposed changes:

"(1) A Baptist theological school ought not merely to receive college graduates, but men with less of general education, even men having only what is called a common English education, offering to every man such opportunities of theological study as he is prepared for and desires.

"(2) Besides covering, for those who are prepared, as wide a range of theological study as could be found elsewhere, such an institution ought to offer further and special courses, so that the ablest and most aspiring students might make extraordinary attainments, preparing them for instruction and original authorship, and helping to make our country less dependent upon foreign scholarship.

"(3) There should be prepared an Abstract of Principles, or careful statement of theological belief, which every professor in such an institution must sign when inaugurated, so as to guard against the rise of erroneous and injurious instruction in such a seat of sacred learning."

This address proved to be epoch-making. All who heard it at the time of delivery, or read it afterward in pamphlet

form, could not fail to note the wisdom of the young theological teacher.

Eighty-eight delegates assembled in Louisville in May, 1857, to consider the question of establishing a general seminary for Southern Baptists. The generous proposition of the South Carolina Baptist Convention was received with favor on every hand. Prof. Boyce and others assured the brethren that South Carolina would do what she had promised. It was finally agreed that a common theological institution should be founded at Greenville, S. C., in 1858, provided that the sum of $100,000 should be raised in that state by May 1, 1858. "The interest of this money (seven thousand) was to be used for the support of three professors, for the purchase of books (not exceeding five hundred dollars annually), and for paying a proper agency in the other States to secure the hundred thousand dollars which was to be raised elsewhere; provided, also, that recitation and lecture rooms could be secured in Greenville free of rent for some years. It was further arranged that if the remaining hundred thousand should not be made up within three years, then the endowment furnished from South Carolina should revert to the Furman University, for theological purposes, and the contributions collected elsewhere to their respective donors." Dr. Broadus, from whom we are quoting, adds: "It was then proposed that a special educational convention should be held at Greenville in May, 1858, to organize the desired institution, provided the South Carolina Baptist Convention should accept these conditions. Committees of five were appointed to prepare a plan of organization, to nominate professors, to secure from the South Carolina Legislature an appropriate charter, to provide for a suitable agency in other States, and to issue an address to Southern Baptists." The committee on plan of organization consisted of J. P. Boyce, J. A. Broadus, B. Manly, Jr., E. T. Winkler and William Williams. These five brilliant young men were afterwards elected as professors in the Seminary. Winkler declined to serve, but the other four constituted the first faculty of the Seminary.

In July, 1857, the Baptist State Convention of South Caro-

lina accepted the proposition of the Louisville Educational Convention, and appointed Rev. James P. Boyce to collect $70,000. Before the meeting of the Educational Convention in Greenville, on May 1, 1858, Mr. Boyce had secured in good subscriptions nearly all of the requisite $70,000, and felt certain that the remainder could be raised in a few weeks. Among those present at the Educational Convention in Greenville were: Dr. G. W. Samson, of Washington, D. C.; Drs. Jeter and Poindexter, and Rev. J. A. Broadus and Rev. B. Manly, Jr., from Virginia, and Prof. William Williams, of Mercer University, Penfield, Ga. There were thirty-three present from different bodies in South Carolina.

The committee on plan of organization of the proposed Seminary had met in August, 1857, in Richmond, Va. There were present at this meeting B. Manly, Jr., J. A. Broadus and J. P. Boyce. Prof. Boyce had requested B. Manly, Jr., to draw up the abstract of doctrinal principles, to be signed by each professor; he had asked John A. Broadus to prepare the outline of the course of study, and had himself drawn up the legal and practical arrangements in regard to trustees and professors. They went over carefully the work as already outlined, with a view to submitting to the Educational Convention in Greenville, May 1, 1858, as perfect a plan of organization as possible.

Some of the acutest minds among Southern Baptists were brought to bear upon the proposed plan of organization at the Greenville Educational Convention. The discussion occupied five days, and the final vote as to every part of the organization was practically unanimous. Prof. Boyce urged that four professors, instead of three, be appointed at the outset. The convention unanimously elected J. P. Boyce, J. A. Broadus, B. Manly, Jr., and E. T. Winkler. William Williams was on the nominating committee, and so could not well be placed in nomination. Winkler declined the election at once, and Broadus, after much anxious consideration, also declined. This delayed the opening of the Seminary for a year. The Board of Trustees of the Seminary, at their meeting in May, 1859, in Richmond, Va., re-elected Broadus and Winkler, and

when the latter declined they elected William Williams. Perhaps no other theological school in the world was ever quite so fortunate in its original faculty.

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary was opened for the reception of students on October 1, 1859. Twenty-six students were enrolled during this first session. The recitations were held in the old Baptist house of worship, which had been divided by partitions into two lecture rooms and a library. The Seminary had received from Furman University about two thousand books, and the Columbian College, of Washington City, also presented nearly two hundred valuable volumes. Dr. Boyce had a large private library containing many valuable books of reference. These were freely lent to his colleagues.

The course of study was divided into eight separate schools, each professor having charge of two schools. James P. Boyce was professor of Systematic Theology, and Polemic Theology and Apologetics; John A. Broadus was professor of Interpretation of the New Testament, and Preparation and Delivery of Sermons; Basil Manly, Jr., was professor of Biblical Introduction and Interpretation of the Old Testament; William Williams was professor of Church History, Church Government and Pastoral Duties. Dr. Boyce was chairman of the faculty, and Dr. Manly was secretary.

During the first session of the Seminary there were ten students from Virginia, three from North Carolina, nine from South Carolina, one from Florida, two from Alabama and one from Missouri. It was evident that the Seminary had a strong hold in Virginia and in South Carolina. To the states west of the Allegheny Mountains the institution seemed rather remote in those days of poor railroad facilities.

Well prepared students could complete the course of study in three years. Men who were able to remain only one session received full credit for the schools which they were able to complete. Several of the students of this first session were men of uncommon ability, who have attained high distinction.

During several months of the first session Dr. Broadus' health was so poor that he was unable to meet his classes. His

colleagues kindly carried on his work in addition to their own. Dr. Broadus, in his *Memoir of James P. Boyce,* tells of a visit which he made with Dr. Boyce in January, 1860, to Charleston: "He invited his invalid colleague to accompany him on what would be his first visit to the city by the sea. The journey had to begin at 4:00 A. M., and continue till toward midnight; but he wrapped his friend in a wonderful overcoat,—a miracle of softness and warmth,—and when we reached Charleston carried him in his own arms from the carriage into his room at the hotel. He seemed strong like a giant, and he was tender as a woman." During all the years that followed, up to the death of Dr. Boyce, in December, 1888, these two noble men, in their friendship and loving co-operation, remind one of David and Jonathan.

During the second session of the Seminary the attendance rose from twenty-six to thirty-six, the increase coming chiefly from Alabama and Mississippi. The Seminary was gradually extending its influence into the Southwest. Soon after the opening of this session political excitement rose to fever heat. Before its close the terrible war between the states had broken out, and it was almost impossible to pursue theological study in the midst of so much excitement and turmoil. The second hundred thousand dollars of endowment had been nearly all subscribed, and the prospect for the school would have been exceedingly bright, but for the bursting of the war clouds over the South.

The session of 1861-2 saw a diminished student body, only twenty-one being enrolled during that session. There were no formal commencement exercises at the close of school, though Rev. G. W. Hyde, of Missouri, was given the diploma of full graduate. From the spring of 1862 until the fall of 1865 the Seminary was closed. Dr. Boyce was for a part of the time chaplain of a South Carolina regiment. He was also elected to the Legislature of South Carolina, and attained prominence in the debates of that body on financial matters. Dr. Broadus was for a short time a missionary in Lee's army. Drs. Manly and Williams preached to country churches in South Carolina.

The war swept out of existence almost all of the endowment

of the Seminary. In the summer of 1865 the four professors met in Greenville to consider the question of reopening the Seminary. The prospect was exceedingly dark, but the men who had the Seminary in charge had brave hearts. After much discussion and prayer, Dr. Broadus said, "Suppose we quietly agree that the Seminary may die, but we'll die first". The four men bowed their heads in silence, and resolved to reopen the Seminary.

During the session of 1865-6 there were only seven students in attendance. Dr. Broadus had in Homiletics only one student, and he a blind man; but he delivered a full course of lectures to this blind student. A few years later there appeared from his pen the famous work entitled *The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons,* the substance of which he had spoken to his solitary blind student. In the following session the attendance increased to seventeen, and continued to grow from year to year. In 1867-8 there were thirty-one students; in 1868-9 there were forty-six, and in 1869-70 the number rose to sixty-one. During the two following sessions it fell to fifty-three, but rose again in 1872-3 to sixty-one. From 1873 to 1877 the attendance varied from sixty-six to sixty-eight men.

It was with great difficulty that money could be obtained to pay the small salaries of the hard-worked professors. Courageous and resourceful as he was, Dr. Boyce found it exceedingly difficult to meet the necessary expenses of the Seminary. He found in Dr. Broadus a valuable helper in financial matters, as well as in the work of instruction. The four professors toiled and struggled against great odds, and kept the institution alive during those years that tried men's souls. It was out of the question to think of raising adequate endowment in those days of poverty and desolation. Many friends of theological education gave five-year bonds for the support of the institution. Often the professors' salaries were far in arrears, and they hardly knew how they were to secure bread for their families. Tempting offers came to one and another from strong churches and from financial institutions, but they turned a deaf ear to all such appeals and kept bravely to their

work. Their sacrifices were equal to any that were made by our soldiers in camp and on the battlefield.

As the years passed by it became increasingly evident that the Seminary could not hope for endowment from South Carolina in her impoverished condition. It was evident to all that the institution would have to be removed to another state, if it hoped to live and meet the needs of the rising ministry in the South. All the professors were much attached to Greenville, where they had such delightful relations, but they finally yielded to the inevitable and gave their consent to the removal of the Seminary to any city in which strong local support could be secured for the permanent endowment of the institution.

As early as April, 1869, the trustees of Union University, at Murfreesboro, Tenn., offered to give $50,000, if the Seminary should be removed to that place. This offer was declined by the trustees of the Seminary. In May, 1871, the Board of Trustees of the Seminary came to an understanding with the trustees of Furman University, by which each institution released the other from all financial claims and liabilities. The trustees of Furman University made it plain that they would deplore the removal of the Seminary to another seat, and only desired to relieve the university from liabilities. The Seminary was now free to go where it pleased, and the trustees resolved that the Seminary should be removed, if thereby sufficient endowment could be obtained to secure the permanency of the institution. This willingness to remove the Seminary was widely advertised, and proposals were invited from any community that might be willing to undertake to put the institution on a more satisfactory basis.

The trustees, at their annual meeting in Raleigh, N. C., in 1872, received a good many propositions for removal from different cities in the South. A committee of removal was appointed, consisting of J. B. Jeter, T. H. Pritchard, S. L. Helm, T. P. Smith, S. Henderson, M. Hillsman and Joseph E. Brown. Dr. Boyce was requested to accompany this committee in visiting various cities. The committee came to the conclusion that it was best to remove to the city of Louisville,

Ky., so soon as a sufficient amount for endowment should be subscribed in Kentucky. It was proposed that Kentucky should give $300,000 toward the permanent endowment of the institution, the other states of the South being asked to give an additional $200,000. Dr. Boyce came to Louisville in the fall of 1872 in order to raise Kentucky's quota of the proposed endowment. But for the financial panic of 1873, he would probably have succeeded in a year or two at most in this great undertaking. As it was, he had to struggle for five years against overwhelming obstacles and difficulties.

In 1869 Dr. Crawford H. Toy was added to the faculty of the Seminary, taking upon himself the work in Old Testament Interpretation. Dr. Toy had made special study of the Semitic languages, and was known to the friends of the Seminary as a brilliant scholar. His coming brought relief to Dr. Broadus, in that Dr. Manly would now do the work in Homiletics. This left Dr. Broadus free to give himself entirely to New Testament studies. In the summer of 1871 Dr. Manly was asked to become president of Georgetown College, Ky. To the great regret of his colleagues, he felt impelled to lay down his work in the Seminary and go to Georgetown.

In 1872 Rev. W. H. Whitsitt was elected as professor of Biblical Introduction, Polemic Theology and assistant professor of New Testament Greek. The coming of Prof. Whitsitt enabled Dr. Broadus to carry on his work in the New Testament department, while at the same time occupying the chair of Homiletics.

From 1872 to 1877 Dr. Boyce was denied the privilege of teaching in the Seminary. The financial burdens of the institution were upon his shoulders, and his brave heart almost failed him at times. His colleagues in Greenville gave themselves with diligence and enthusiasm to the work of instruction. Dr. Williams, during these years, carried the burden of two heavy departments of instruction. Toward the close of the period his health suddenly gave way, and he died of consumption at Aiken, S. C., on February 20, 1877. He was a man of high intellectual powers and a very lovable character. His lectures

on Systematic Theology were the joy and inspiration of the student body.

In the fall of 1877 the Seminary was removed from Greenville, S. C., to Louisville, Ky. As Dr. Broadus has said, "It was physically no great task to remove the Seminary from Greenville to Louisville. There was nothing to move, except the library of a few thousand volumes and three professors,—Broadus, Toy, and Whitsitt,—only one of whom had a family". And yet, the train which brought such baggage to Louisville might well have been welcomed by the mayor and all the citizens of Louisville; for the coming of these three men to join their colleague in Louisville meant much for the moral and spiritual atmosphere of the fair city by the Ohio.

With rare wisdom, Dr. Boyce deferred the erection of buildings for the Seminary until the endowment should be sufficient to meet the necessary current expenses. He knew that costly and beautiful buildings do not make an institution great. Had the war found the Seminary with a handsome plant but partly paid for, the school might have been hopelessly involved in debt. The real estate and inexpensive boarding hall owned by the Seminary in Greenville were sold at a considerable advance on the purchase price when the institution was removed to Louisville. The same cautious policy was pursued during the first two years in Louisville. The year 1879 marked a crisis in the history of the Seminary. In 1874 five-year bonds for current expenses, amounting to $70,000, had been secured by Dr. Boyce, and these would soon be exhausted. The productive endowment was still quite small. Where could money be procured to keep the ship afloat? Dr. Boyce had recourse to the throne of grace. Professors and students were urged to unite in earnest prayer that God would put it into the heart of some man of large means to make a gift of $50,000 to the endowment. Dr. Boyce inserted in two or three of the denominational papers a brief note expressing the hope that some one would be moved to make this large gift. And God put it into the heart of Hon. Joseph E. Brown, of Atlanta, Ga., to make the gift. February 11, 1880, was a notable day in the history

of the Seminary, for on that day Senator Brown turned over to Dr. Boyce $50,000 in cash and good securities.

Mr. George W. Norton, of Louisville, who had previously given generously to the Seminary, now came to Dr. Boyce's aid in an effort to raise the productive endowment speedily to $200,000. "Mr. Norton suggested an amendment to the charter, requiring that the principal of all contributions for endowment made after February 1, 1880, be held forever sacred and inviolate, only the income to be expended,—and if any part of the principal were used for expenses, then the whole should revert to the donors,—and that a Financial Board of five business men in Louisville should be elected every year to invest the principal, hold the securities, and pay over the income to the Treasurer of the Seminary." Such an amendment was promptly passed by the Legislature of Kentucky; and Messrs. G. W. and W. F. Norton at once came forward with generous gifts to the endowment. Dr. Broadus went to New York in the interest of the endowment, and collected in cash and good subscriptions $30,000. The subscriptions would have added $40,000 to the Seminary's permanent funds but for the failure in business of one of the chief subscribers. By 1881 the endowment of the Seminary amounted to $200,000. This was only a beginning, but it gave confidence to all the friends of the institution. Senator Brown's gift of $50,000 had saved the life of the Seminary.

The second trial of the critical year, 1879, was more distressing to Boyce and Broadus than financial difficulties could possibly be. Dr. Toy had come to accept the Kuenen-Wellhausen view of the Old Testament, and was teaching the newer German rationalistic theories in his classes. He was perfectly conscientious in it all, and thought that his views would help to a better understanding of the Old Testament as a part of God's revelation to men. Boyce and Broadus foresaw that their brilliant young colleague would inevitably depart yet further from the evangelical position, and that the Seminary would lose the sympathy of its great and growing constituency. Dr. Toy wrote out his views on critical questions and submitted them to the Board of Trustees at the annual meeting in Atlanta, Ga., at the same time tendering his resignation, that the Board

might be relieved of any embarrassment, if they could not approve of his teaching. With sad hearts the trustees voted to accept the resignation. Dr. Broadus wrote home: "Poor, bereaved three; we have lost our jewel of learning, our beloved and noble brother, the pride of the Seminary. God bless the Seminary, God bless Toy, and God help us, sadly but steadfastly, to do our providential duty."

Dr. Manly, after eight years as president of Georgetown College, returned to the Seminary in the fall of 1879 as professor of Old Testament Interpretation. He also relieved Dr. Broadus of the care of the Students' Fund.

The number of students in the Seminary in 1877-8, the first year in Louisville, was eighty-nine—twenty-one more than the largest attendance at Greenville. Two years later it fell to eighty-three—the lowest record in Louisville. In 1882-3 it suddenly rose to one hundred and twenty, and, while there was a slight decline from 1883 to 1886, the number never again fell below a hundred.

In May, 1881, Rev. G. W. Riggan, of Virginia, was appointed as assistant instructor in Hebrew, Greek and Homiletics, thus affording relief to Drs. Broadus and Whitsitt and enabling Dr. Manly to resume his teaching in Biblical Introduction. Mr. Riggan was an M.A. of Richmond College, and a full graduate of the Seminary. His brilliant career as a teacher was cut short by his early death on April 14, 1885.

Rev. T. M. Hawes was appointed to teach elocution in 1884. For a quarter of a century he has served with great acceptance, though, being a Presbyterian, he is not officially a member of the faculty.

In May, 1885, John R. Sampey, of Alabama, was selected to take the position left vacant by the death of Dr. Riggan. He served as assistant in Hebrew, Greek and Homiletics for three years. He then gave his place in Greek to Rev. A. T. Robertson, of North Carolina, who was elected assistant instructor in Greek and Homiletics in May, 1888. The accession of these young men brought much relief to the older professors, especially in the correction of written exercises, which became very burdensome as the attendance increased.

During the session of 1883-4 Dr. Boyce began to lay plans for housing the Seminary. He bought vacant lots in the heart of Louisville, at a cost of about $50,000, and made earnest efforts to raise money with which to meet the deferred payments. In March, 1886, Dr. Broadus went to New York to solicit funds for the Seminary's first building. Let him tell the story in his own words: "The sum desired was sixty thousand dollars. Mr. Bostwick, at the first interview, agreed to give fifteen thousand. Upon being told of this the same day, Mr. John D. Rockefeller cheerily added twenty-five thousand. So next morning Dr. Boyce knew that two thirds of the amount had been given, but more than half *on condition* (Mr. Bostwick being averse to conditional gifts) that Boyce should at once raise money enough to finish paying for the land. It was an unpleasant day in Louisville, but he turned out, lame from a recent attack of gout, saw the Nortons and Mr. Theodore Harris and others, and telegraphed that night that he had the money in cash promises,—nearly thirty thousand,—but *on condition* that the remaining twenty thousand for the building should be raised in New York. *Hic labor, hoc opus.* It took nearly three weeks." New York Hall really cost nearly $80,000. Senator Brown, of Georgia, voluntarily sent his check for $5,000 toward the expenses of the building. New York Hall was erected in 1887.

Dr. Boyce's health began to decline during the session of 1886-7. The Board of Trustees, in May, 1887, voted Dr. Boyce a leave of absence, and elected Dr. F. H. Kerfoot, of Virginia, to be co-professor of Systematic Theology and Church Government and Pastoral Duties. The Board created the office of president, largely as a compliment to Dr. Boyce. He did no more teaching in the Seminary, but sought to build up his health by travel, and also to get all his business interests in such shape that he could lay them down. In the summer of 1888 he went to Europe with his family. He died at Pau, France, on December 28, 1888.

Only two months before his death Dr. Boyce received the good news that Mrs. J. Lawrence Smith had decided to give

$50,000 for the purpose of erecting a library building for the Seminary. Dr. Boyce bequeathed to the Seminary his own theological library of five thousand volumes, very few of which were duplicates of works already in the Seminary collection.

In May, 1889, Dr. Broadus was made president of the Seminary, and Dr. Kerfoot became professor of Systematic Theology and financial agent of the Seminary. The endowment of the Seminary grew rapidly during the period from 1889 to 1892. In 1892 Norton Hall, erected at a cost of $60,000 by the Norton family, was dedicated. This building contains a chapel, five recitation rooms and numerous offices.

It may be of interest to note the growth of the attendance. In 1887-8 there were one hundred and fifty-seven students. The number rose slightly during the next three sessions, and in 1891-2 it suddenly rose to two hundred and thirty-six. Not content with this phenomenal increase, it went up to two hundred and sixty in 1892-3. The figures stood at two hundred and sixty-seven when Dr. Broadus died, in March, 1895.

Dr. Basil Manly died January 31, 1892. Prof. Sampey, who was already associate professor of Old Testament Interpretation, was promoted to the full professorship. Dr. E. C. Dargan, of South Carolina, was elected associate professor of Homiletics, and Dr. A. T. Robertson, while retaining his position as Dr. Broadus' helper in Greek, was elected professor of Biblical Introduction.

It is a pleasing thought that Boyce was permitted to see the Seminary so well established that all fear of its extinction should be removed. Manly saw the day of larger things, and Broadus lived to witness still other evidences of the growing popularity of the Seminary. With the death of Dr. Broadus, the last of the original faculty passed away. He had given to the Seminary thirty-six years of brilliant and devoted service.

In 1894 Rev. W. J. McGlothlin was elected assistant instructor in Hebrew and Old Testament. Since 1899 he has filled the chair of Church History. In 1895 Dr. H. H. Harris was made professor of Biblical Introduction and Polemic Theology. He died in January, 1897. In May, 1896, Rev. W. O. Carver was chosen as assistant instructor in New Testament

Interpretation. He was promoted in due time to be associate professor of New Testament Interpretation and also professor of Comparative Religion and Missions.

Prof. W. H. Whitsitt was elected to succeed Dr. Broadus in the presidency. At the beginning of his administration the number of students soared to three hundred and sixteen. He wrote many letters to prospective students and induced many brethren to speak in the interest of the Seminary at the district associations.

In the spring of 1896 an attack on Dr. Whitsitt was made in one of the denominational papers, because of his views on Baptist history. The situation became more tangled as time went on, his opponents magnifying certain tactical mistakes and trying to make it appear that he was not loyal to his denomination. At length Dr. Whitsitt resigned, and the Board of Trustees, in May, 1899, accepted the resignation. He retired after twenty-seven years of continuous service. He has remained loyal to the Seminary, and enjoys the confidence and love of his many pupils.

Dr. J. P. Greene, of Missouri, was chosen by the Board to succeed President Whitsitt. When Dr. Greene declined the position, the Board met in Atlanta in July, 1899, and unanimously elected Dr. E. Y. Mullins as president. Dr. Mullins came from Newton Centre, Mass., to inquire into the situation, and at once undertook the important task assigned him. Dr. Kerfoot resigned in the summer of 1899 and presently became secretary of the Home Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

In the readjustment of classes, incident to the resignation of Drs. Whitsitt and Kerfoot, Dr. Mullins became professor of Theology (Systematic and Biblical), while Dr. McGlothlin was made professor of Church History. Dr. George B. Eager was added to the faculty in May, 1900, as professor of Biblical Introduction and Pastoral Theology.

When Dr. Mullins was made president and financial agent of the Seminary, the productive endowment was something over $400,000. Within the first ten years of his administration he has been able to add about $200,000; and the effort to se-

cure an additional $600,000 was already well advanced before the close of the fiftieth year of the Seminary's history. It is hoped that the entire amount will be subscribed within a year or eighteen months.

In 1906 Rev. B. H. DeMent was called to the Seminary to take the new chair of Sunday School Pedagogy, which was made possible through the co-operation of the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.

In 1907 Dr. Dargan resigned the chair of Homiletics, which he had filled with signal ability since 1895, and accepted the pastorate of the First Baptist Church of Macon, Ga. Rev. C. S. Gardner was chosen in May, 1907, to succeed him in the Seminary.

The history of the Seminary is a history of toil and struggle crowned with the blessing of God. Boyce, and Broadus, and Manly, and Williams put their hearts' blood into it. So did Riggan, and Kerfoot, and Harris. Whitsitt loved it, and still loves it, with rare devotion. Toy gave it ten of the best years of his life. Its present faculty of eight are devoted to its upbuilding. And the time would fail to tell of the men and women who have prayed for it and given out of much self-sacrifice, that it might live and grow and do a mighty work for the Kingdom of God.

During the decade in which Dr. Mullins has presided over its fortunes the attendance has never fallen below two hundred and thirty-one, and the fiftieth year found three hundred and twenty young men enrolled as students. For several years the young women attending the Woman's Missionary Training School of Louisville have been admitted to its classes. The number of pupils enrolled in the English Bible classes has risen to almost two hundred—an array of consecrated Christian manhood and womanhood sufficient to stir the heart of any teacher of God's Word.

May the second fifty years witness achievements worthy of the sacrifices and labors of the fathers!

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES AND TEACHER TRAINING.

BY WILBUR FISKE TILLETT, D.D., LL.D., DEAN OF THE BIBLICAL DEPARTMENT, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, NASHVILLE, TENN.

There is no better way to celebrate the close of the first half century in the life of a great theological school than to make it the occasion for discussing the larger and better equipment that is needed by it and by other theological seminaries, in order to train and send out into the church the kind of ministry that is needed to meet the exacting demands of the present and the larger demands of the future. The curriculum of the average theological seminary, a half century ago, had generally four schools in it: (1) Hebrew and New Testament Greek, and these two languages were frequently taught by the same man, (2) Church History, (3) Systematic Theology, the most important and lively branch of which was Polemics, and (4) Homiletics. This was for a long time all that was recognized as necessary in the curriculum of a well-equipped theological seminary. It seemed to meet all the wants of the preachers of that day and train them adequately for the mission they were called to fill in the life of the church and the world.

But what marvelous and far-reaching changes have we seen take place in the life of the world in the last third of a century. Ours has been and still is an age of transition. There is scarcely any phase of the great life of the world that has not been seriously changed in this generation. We are like passengers on a moving train; and not only are we moving, but we can see all the rest of the world moving. The great currents of theological thought have changed and are making for themselves new outlets and channels of expression. The points of emphasis in theology are widely different from what they were thirty years ago. The emphasis has been shifted from polemics to ethics; from church polity and rituals and sacraments to benevolences

and helpful activities for ministering to the intellectual, moral, social and spiritual needs of men; from the sovereignty and justice of God to his Fatherhood and love; from original guilt and the total depravity of human nature to that which is divine in the nature of man. The demand in oratory has shifted from manner to matter; from that which stirs the feelings to that which appeals to the thought and reason; from rhetoric and imagination to logic and science. Sectarian pride and denominational rivalry and church loyalty cannot be counted on to bring people out to public worship as was once the case. Reverence for the preacher because of his profession is not, at least in our growing towns and cities, what it once was. He has to depend now not upon his office but upon his manhood and his message for a hearing. The days of great revivals, when multitudes of sinners responded to the passionate appeals of the preacher and came to the altar and were convicted and converted then and there, are largely a thing of the past. These revivals being no longer, as they once were, the principal source from which the church receives additions to her membership, the pastor now looks to another source, the Sunday school, for a large proportion of the additions to his church.

These changed conditions surrounding the work of the minister of today call for a corresponding change in the training he needs to fit him for efficient service in the church and in the world. This is why the old curriculum, with its Hebrew and Greek, its History, Homiletics and Systematic Theology, is being enlarged and enriched by courses in practical sociology, in the study of comparative religions, in home and foreign missions, in modern methods of evangelization, in ethics, in science and philosophy of religion, and now last of all by yet another course, the nature and value of which is the purpose of this address to set forth.

In discussing the subject assigned me in this program, "Theological Seminaries and Teacher Training", I shall undertake to establish the following points:

First—The need that exists in theological seminaries today for a chair that may be designated as that of "Religious Education and Sunday School Pedagogy". The special work of this

chair will be (1) to define and emphasize the mission of the Christian church as the teacher of religion and ethics among men, and to point out how it can best accomplish its mission of education in the world; and (2) to give a new and larger emphasis to the teaching function of the Christian minister and to point out what should be done to prepare him for meeting the demands upon him for work that is educative and constructive.

Secondly—I desire to connect this call of the church and the ministry to larger service in the work of religious education with the Sunday school as the mightiest, perhaps, of all modern agencies to be employed in the future by the church in saving men from sin, in educating them in a knowledge of the great essential facts and truths of religion, and in training them for a life of Christian service. I desire to show why and how theological seminaries should train those who are to be pastors in a knowledge of the ideal Sunday school and how to organize it, and how the pastor should be himself the teacher and inspirer of its officers and teachers. I shall take the position that the time has come when theological seminaries, located as they are in cities and thickly populated sections of the country, should have classes open to and especially designed for the training of Sunday school teachers.

Thirdly—I desire to show how this new department of theological education grows out of and is connected with the new educational theories and methods that are being introduced into the educational world generally, and especially with the new study of psychology, the all but new science known as the psychology of religion, with its emphasis upon the religious psychology of childhood and adolescence.

The bare mention of these several points included in my theme shows that it is a question of pressing, practical importance to theological seminaries and to the church, that I have been asked to discuss.

The science of education has received during the last few years such attention from thoughtful men and women as it never received before, perhaps, in all the centuries of the world's history. Traditional theories and methods of educa-

tion have been under review, and the literature that this scientific study of the subject has called forth represents the best thinking of some of the greatest intellectual and moral leaders of our day. The result is a widespread awakening on the subject of education generally. But that phase of this general awakening to which I would call attention is the important work that has been done in the interest of truer and better methods of moral and religious education. And it is but fitting that I should make mention in this connection of the splendid service that has been rendered in this forward movement by the Religious Education Association by means of its annual gatherings for discussing all phases of moral and religious education, by its bi-monthly journal, titled *Religious Education,* and by its annually published volumes containing papers of great value. Nothing, perhaps, shows how rapid and extensive has been this awakening to the importance of moral and religious education so effectively as the bare statement that during the last five years 396 text-books for use in the work of moral and religious education have been published; 107 text-books on Sunday School Pedagogy, and 102 volumes that treat of the fundamental principles and methods of moral and religious education—altogether 605 volumes in the last five years.

There are two phases of this subject that are of the utmost importance. First, the widespread movement to increase the efficiency of the Sunday school, both as an evangelizing agency in the saving of the young and as the church's largest and best agency for the religious education of its membership; and second, connected with this, the movement to establish chairs of Religious Education and Sunday School Pedagogy in all the leading theological seminaries of the country. The better training of pastors as religious teachers; the training, secondly, of lay assistants to pastors, men who shall give their whole time to the service of the church and receive compensation therefor; and thirdly, the training of any and all men and women in reach who are engaged in Sunday school teaching or are desirous of preparing themselves for this work—this is the important work that will fall to the professor who fills this chair. Already such a chair as this has been founded in some of the

seminaries. Your own Seminary has led the way in this important forward movement, while the University of Chicago, Union Seminary of New York, the Biblical Department of Vanderbilt University, and others that might be mentioned have followed; and still other seminaries are meeting this need by making provision for doing the work indicated in connection with professorships already in existence, or (as notably in the case of Hartford Seminary) by association with adjacent schools of Religious Pedagogy. This is highly encouraging when we recall that only two years ago a committee of three, appointed by the Religious Education Association to investigate the work being done in this time by the theological seminaries of the country, found so little being done as to necessitate a most discouraging report, saying, along with other things in this report, that "perhaps ninety-five per cent. of the students in our theological seminaries are being trained with a view single to fitting them for a ministry to adults alone". We feel reasonably sure that within the next few years every representative and well-equipped theological seminary in America will make provision in its curriculum for work in Religious Education and Sunday School Pedagogy. It is to be hoped that the Sunday schools of the Southern Baptist church and of the Southern Methodist church will so soon complete the work which they have undertaken in endowing the two chairs already started in your Seminary and at Vanderbilt that the Sunday schools of all other churches will be encouraged by their example and success to fall into line with this most fitting method of providing these chairs in all the seminaries, viz., by means of money raised in the Sunday schools.

When it comes to pass, as indeed it now has, that from seventy-five to eighty per cent. of the conversions and additions to the church that are reported come from the ranks of the Sunday school, and the average age of conversion is fourteen years, surely the theological seminaries will not always hold on to traditional methods and direct ninety-five per cent. of their training of preachers to preparing them for working with adults and only five per cent. of it to working with and preach-

ing to the young, to that portion of our church population that yields three-fourths of the additions to our membership.

But how shall we make a place for this new chair in the already overcrowded theological curriculum? Each faculty can best answer that question for itself. But we will let the late Dr. Harper, of the University of Chicago, the great specialist in the study and teaching of Hebrew, suggest how this difficulty may at least in part be met. "President Harper said that the study of Hebrew consumes about one-fifth of all the time spent by the student in the theological seminary, and that a very small percentage of ministers in charge of churches ever make any real use of Hebrew in actual life. 'And yet,' he continued, 'not more than two or three seminaries in the country have the courage to do as they ought to do—make Hebrew an elective'. Without venturing to suggest to what part of our curriculum the knife should be applied, this comment by one of the foremost educators and leading Hebrew specialists of the world may indicate to the seminary faculties one means of making at least a little place and time for preparation for discharging a function of the ministry that is second to no other." (See report of committee in *Religious Education,* June, 1907, page 45.)

We have long been in the habit of setting forth the office of preaching as the one great duty of the Christian ministry, and the foremost agency and main reliance of the church for the evangelization of the world and the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. Let us not depreciate the place or importance of preaching, of the public proclamation of the Gospel in that manner with which we are familiar and which has been attended with such large results in the salvation of men. But let us not, on the other hand, give too narrow a definition to the office and work of the ministry; and least of all does it behoove us to contrast Christian preaching with Christian teaching and declare that God calls the church and ministry to the work of preaching, but not to that of teaching. Teaching, rightly defined, is just as important a part of the work of the Christian church and ministry as is preaching. That is poor preaching which does not partake of the nature of

true Christian teaching and which fails to educate morally and religiously; and that education is certainly not entitled to be called Christian which fails to make its chief and ultimate aim in the training of the mind, to be the building up of moral character, the making of cultured Christian manhood and womanhood—and this is the end of all preaching. It is well for us to remember that Jesus Christ, the first great preacher of the Christian religion, is oftener called a teacher than he is a preacher, and is oftener declared to have taught than he is to have preached. And that portion of his work which partakes of the nature of Christian teaching is much larger than that which can properly be designated as preaching in the sense in which we now use that term. The great commission reads: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," but it also reads in terms just as divine: "Go ye and teach all nations—teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," and here it is that the precious words are added, "And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world". The church is divinely called and commissioned to the work of education. In carrying out that commission it has wisely founded institutions of learning as well as built churches, and the most influential colleges and universities of the world are those founded by the Christian church. The debt of this nation and of the world to the denominational colleges is one that cannot easily be overestimated—and in this day, when church schools are being discriminated against by certain philanthropists, it is well for somebody to call attention to the large contribution they have made to the manhood and womanhood of the nation and the world. But, important as these church institutions of learning are, they are by no means the whole or even a half of the measure of the work and influence of the church as a teacher. The teaching function of the church can be estimated, in its largest significance, only when the far-reaching work of its many thousands of pastors as teachers and educators is fully considered.

Of the great Preacher it was said, "We know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do the wonderful

works that thou doest except God be with him". And Saint Paul finds the end of all ministerial training to be service, equipment for work—that "the man of God may be complete, thoroughly furnished unto all good works". We may say, then, that preaching and teaching and ministering are the threefold commission of Christ to the Christian church; and in our day we are being called, not to preach less, but to put more emphasis than we have hitherto done upon Christian teaching and upon Christian service as the most effective methods of establishing the Kingdom of God in the world. The mission of the theological seminary of today is to train men for preaching, for teaching, for ministering in a way to meet the conditions and needs of today. And does not this mean that Religious Education and Sunday School Pedagogy and Christian Sociology should enter into that training just as much as Dogmatic Theology and Homiletics?

No movement in the Christian church in modern times is more significant and encouraging than the improvement that is being brought about in the work and character of our Sunday schools. Some of the ablest scholars and wisest leaders of the church in our day have been at work on the problem of how to improve the Sunday school and make it the moral and educational and evangelistic power it can and ought to be in the life and work of the church; and their labors have already yielded rich results. Never, in all its long history, has the church produced such a splendid literature as it is sending forth today in the form of magazines, papers and lesson helps for the study of the Bible, as well as larger and more permanent volumes that make the study of the Bible at once entertaining, instructive and illuminating. The introduction of a system of graded Sunday school lessons is one of the notable signs of this forward movement in the modern Sunday school. But this very improvement that is taking place in the literature and methods and equipment of the Sunday school is revealing to an alarming extent the weakest spot in the life of the church today, and that is the lack of men and women properly qualified to teach the classes in our Sunday schools. No other man or woman that I know of in all the world is undertaking to do so important and

far-reaching a work, in so short a time and with so little preparation for his work, as the average Sunday school teacher. And generally he is fully conscious of his limitations and inadequate preparation for his work. Most Sunday school teachers are not volunteers, but have to be draughted into service; they enter upon their work reluctantly and are ready to give up at any time. We must needs go slowly, therefore, in revealing to them the qualifications of the ideal teacher, or they will resign at once and refuse to attempt to do work for which they see plainly they are wholly unprepared. And this is one of the most embarrassing features in the situation. And so we declare unhesitatingly that the greatest *desideratum* in the modern church is unquestionably an adequate supply of capable and trained Sunday school teachers, men and women who are both intellectually and spiritually qualified to help and guide the young life of the church, both in the study of the Bible and in that moral and religious education that is the aim and end of all Sunday school teaching.

These sentiments are confirmed by a strong paper that recently appeared in the *Journal of Religious Education*: "But if the public demands such thorough training for teaching history and geography and arithmetic, why," asks Rev. Carl F. Henry, "should it be expected to entrust the moral and religious education of its youth to those who have made no preparation for the discharge of such an important function?" A certificate of competency must be produced before one may teach the "rule of three", but we ask no preparation whatever on the part of the million and more Sunday school teachers whose sublime and sacred duty it is to teach the *rule of life*. The Lambeth Conference of 1888 said, "The instruction of Sunday school teachers ought to be regarded as an indispensable part of the pastoral work of the parish priest". The world needs not only "an educated ministry, but a ministry of educators". The pastor should be equipped to train teachers as well as to teach. Whether the ministers like it or not, more and more the churches will hold them responsible for the popular education of the children and youth in the Sunday schools. There should be a speedy remodeling of theological curricula in such

a manner as to enable the student to prepare himself to do that which he will be expected to do, and intelligently to take advantage of the strategic opportunity of his work—the moral and religious fashioning of the child and the adolescent. When our ministers are trained to be teachers of teachers we shall have entered the way to realizing the ideal of Dr. John M. Gregory, who said that "the Sunday school ought to be the best and most successful of all schools, because it is openly, freely and fearlessly religious. The whole moral and religious nature of the child is open to its work. Its education ought therefore to dominate, inspire and consecrate all other education. Through the Sunday school Christianity is free to pour its faith into all other schools. . . . . So soon as it becomes strong enough and skillful enough in its teachings, it will color and control all learning with its own higher ideals and hopes. The true interests of mankind, as well as the progress and final success of Christianity itself, demand that this shall be done".

The fact that there is a serious decadence of Bible study and of the religious education of children in the home in our day increases the responsibility of the Sunday school and of the Sunday school teachers, and makes it all the more important that these teachers should be not only competent to do their work, but fully aroused to their moral responsibility for doing it.

What now can theological seminaries do to help meet this pressing need of the church? The Sunday school boards of the various churches are providing lecturers to travel abroad and hold institutes for Sunday school teachers, and are also providing courses of reading covering two or three years of helpful study. Some few Bible schools in different parts of the country are doing valuable work in this line. In some of the cities one or two of the Christian denominations are providing regular lectures and class instruction for all of their Sunday school teachers who will attend. But to mention these few sporadic efforts at teacher training, and to concede that there are others not here mentioned, is but to show how little the church is doing in this line. The situation is a serious one. The conviction is growing and deepening that the only satisfactory solution of this problem in sight is in and through the

pastors of the church. The problem is theirs and the remedy is with them and with those who train them for service. Let our pastors, then, be trained more with reference to the Sunday school, its importance and ideal equipment. Let them be made to see in the Sunday school, rightly conducted, their right arm of strength both for the salvation and the religious instruction of their young people, and also their training for Christian service. Let the preacher be so taught that he can and will teach those who are to teach others; let him be so educated that he can and will educate those who are to give moral and religious education to others. If the church is large enough and wealthy enough, as thousands of churches are, let it give the pastor a trained assistant, especially qualified for doing the work of teacher training in whatever manner seems best adapted to each church. But if this is impossible, and the church is not wealthy and not large, as will generally be the case, then let the preacher himself teach his teachers and come himself into the closest possible touch with the young life of his church. Here is where work counts for most.

If the average age at which people are converted is fourteen years, then it follows that the turning point in the moral and religious life, the critical and strategic point for conquest, is not upstairs in the great congregation where the pastor is preaching to people who will average perhaps from thirty to thirty-five years of age, but down there in the basement or over there in the annex, where the boys and girls are to be found with their teachers in the Sunday school, or gathered in their clubs and leagues. Conversions in mature life are growing relatively more and more rare and conversions in youth more frequent. Statistics taken something over fifty years ago in one of the churches showed that about 60 per cent. of those entering the ministry were converted in revivals and 40 per cent. elsewhere. Twenty-five years ago the per cent. converted in revivals, as shown by these statistics, had dropped to 29; and five years ago these statistics showed it had dropped to 25 per cent. These are very significant figures. As the converts come now mostly from the Sunday school, he is the wise pastor who will magnify his oppor-

tunity to work here and who will make companions and co-workers of his Sunday school teachers in seeking to save, to instruct and to train for service the young people of the church. There is no one phase of the pastor's work that will count for so much, that will make his moral and religious influence so far-reaching and lasting in a given pastoracy, be it long or short, as study and time devoted to training the teachers in his Sunday school, and personal work for and with the young people of the church. Then let his training in the theological seminary emphasize this all-important work and prepare him for it.

I have spoken of the possibility of our large and wealthy churches providing their pastor with a capable and trained assistant. Let me now discuss this point briefly. Among those who constituted the ministry of the early church we find mentioned not only prophets, apostles, bishops and elders, preachers, pastors and evangelists, but also teachers, whose title must have indicated something of their special work in the church, and others who were called to serve tables and look after the financial work and benevolence of the church. All these titles and duties surely did not belong to and describe the same man—the pastor. Now there should be, I contend, more than one man, the preacher, fully employed in the work of every large and prosperous church. Is there not a need for at least three ministering ones, viz., a preacher, a teacher and a deaconess? Hundreds and thousands of our city churches are too large for one man to do all or even one-half of the religious work that ought to be done. Every modern, well-equipped city church could use to the greatest possible advantage, in addition to its pastor and pastor's assistant, a layman with special training and gifts for religious work, whose whole time shall be given to what we may call the religious education of the church, and who shall be paid accordingly. The idea is not that he shall be an assistant preacher of the church, to fill the pulpit for the pastor in his absence—to make him such will mean that his connection with the church will be speedily terminated by his transferrence to a pastoracy of his own. Nor should he be turned into a church financier, to collect money and manage the finances of the congregation—which would be to make

absolutely impossible effective and satisfactory work in the line of religious education. But his work shall be that of a guide and leader in religious education. He might serve, if necessary, as superintendent of the Sunday school, but he must certainly serve as a teacher of the teachers in the Sunday school, and of those in training for service as Sunday school teachers, meeting them regularly not less than once, and possibly as often as three times, a week. This man shall give personal attention to all organizations, societies, boys' clubs, etc., in the church, helping and guiding them in their work, so that they all may be directed toward the religious education of the church and toward training for service. He shall keep in close touch with the parents and children of the church and especially with the boys who need the companionship of a man who understands them, is interested in them and their boyish pleasures, and who can turn everything to their moral good. Such a man will look after the circulation of religious literature in the homes of the people, and help to put good books into the hands of the young people and of the parents of the church, and will stimulate all of every age to read books that are worth while, books that will contribute to their instruction and edification along all lines of Bible knowledge and Christian benevolence and service, and especially good biographies. He will be a close and trustworthy adviser to the parents and young people of the church in the matter of education, and will press this important matter upon those who are liable to neglect it. Such a man working in perfect harmony with the pastor of the church, and seeking always and everywhere along with the pastor for the conversion of sinners, especially for the early conversion of the young in the Sunday school and in the home, advising with the pastor about how and where each member can be put to work—such a man, layman though he be, can render quite as valuable service in helping the church do her manifold work in our day as can the pastor.

Now, why should not our theological seminaries train lay teachers and educators for the important work I have described? A course of study covering the English Bible and Bible history, the psychology of religion, religious pedagogy,

the modern Sunday school, Christian sociology and some phases of pastoral theology, and the essential doctrines of the Christian system—such a course of study (which might be enlarged and extended to advantage in some cases) would in one or two years' time prepare a man for greatest possible usefulness in the church. And such a man would make the Sunday school a power for good.

It is needless to say that if the preacher is to teach, he must surely himself first be taught; if he is to educate, he must himself be educated. There are no greater teachers and educators in the history of the world than the great preachers of the Christian church. Most of them have been personal embodiments of that union of intellectual culture and moral character that constitutes the best possible definition of what we mean by education, viz., a definition by example. Every young preacher preparing for future service should read the lives of these great preachers who have been the forerunners and the creators of all that is best in the world's education.

There is an interesting and instructive little volume by Dr. John A. Brodus titled *The History of Preaching,* with which I am sure the members of this audience are familiar. It is, as you will recall, a study chiefly of the great and influential preachers of history, those who have left the impress of their life-work upon the times in which they lived. With varying degrees of the fullness in biographical detail, the author presents to us altogether some fifty or sixty of these illustrious men of God who delivered their messages to the generations in which they lived. Beginning with the Bible preachers, such as Moses and Isaiah, John the Baptist and Paul, he passes on to the early Christian centuries and presents to us such men as Origen, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, "the golden-mouthed", and Augustine, the greatest light of the Western church. From the medieval and Reformation period he takes up Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Aquinas, Antony of Padua, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli and others. Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Fenelon, Claude, Massillon and Saurin, who helped to make illustrious the reign of Louis XIV in France, are compared and contrasted with the great English and Scotch divines—Wyclif, Knox, Jeremy Taylor,

Baxter, Owen, Bunyan, Howe, Barrow, South, Tillotson, Doddridge, Whitefield, Wesley, Robert Hall and Thomas Chalmers, from each and all of whom he draws suggestive and useful lessons. And one of the most suggestive of these lessons is a fact of which we would here make distinct and particular mention, viz., that nearly every one of these illustrious preachers of righteousness, whose names find an honored place in the history of the pulpit, obtained, in preparation for his holy calling, the very best education that was possible in the age and country in which he lived—and most of these men had special and extensive training in theological studies in addition to their general education, and their preparation fitted them for understanding and meeting the special needs of the day in which they lived. Is it a mere incident that an unusually careful and thorough training in youth should have been followed in these cases by unusual usefulness and eminence in later life; or do the two facts sustain to each other, in some degree at least, the relation of cause and effect? Is it an accident that Moses and Paul, the two most influential characters in Old and New Testament history, should have been the most thoroughly educated young men of whom we have any account in the Bible? Is it an accident that Chrysostom, "the prince of preachers", even to this day counted by the historian as the greatest preacher who has ever appeared in the Christian church, should have gone through all the schools accessible in his day? Is it to be accounted an accident that Martin Luther and John Wesley, the greatest religious leaders and most influential preachers in the history of the Christian church, should have come from great universities, where they tarried longer and studied more extensively than their fellows?

The Educational Ideal of the Ministry is the appropriate and expressive title of one of the most helpful and inspiring of recent books discussing the kind of ministry that is needed for our day. No young preacher of any church can afford to leave that book by Dr. W. H. P. Faunce unread. The day when merely emotional and hortatory oratory can hold the multitude has passed away. What a man says has grown relatively more important than it used to be, as compared with how he

expresses his thoughts. The preacher who goes into the pulpit because he has to say something and fills the hour with things which were once fresh but have now become the platitudes of religion, will soon preach to empty pews. It is not the man who "has to say something", but the man who "has something to say" that the churches are needing today. The man with a message is the man who has a great idea and a great faith, and who turns ideas into moral ideas, and inspires to high living by high thinking. The preacher must in our day give his hearers something that they can take away with them, or they will not return. The preacher who merely entertains leaves his people at the end of years of pastoral association no wiser than he found them; the teaching preacher is he who expounds out of a full head and full heart the great doctrines and duties of Christianity in such manner and extent that the whole church is lifted by his luminous and instructive preaching into truer conceptions of the Bible, of God, of Christ, of duty, of service, of all that constitutes the religion of Christ. No educator can do more important and appreciated work for his students than the teaching preacher does for his people. A Christian pastor should feel, when he begins his pastoracy, as much under obligation to carry on the Christian education of his people as does any educator when he receives a class for instruction and guidance in the pursuit of knowledge.

Let our theological seminaries then give a new and larger emphasis to this teaching function in our sacred vocation, as the best method of preparing men for efficient service in the church in our day. The work of calling sinners to repentance and getting people into the church is, although important, nevertheless but a small part of the Christian minister's work, and in this sphere, it must be granted, an uneducated minister often seems to equal his more educated brother. But when it comes to teaching and instructing the people, feeding them on the strong meat of the Gospel, instructing them in the great cardinal doctrines of Christianity, raising them through and by the preached Word into a broader and more intelligent type of piety, making them more diligent and appreciative

Bible students by the preaching they hear—this is a work that only a minister possessing broad scholarship and a full and accurate knowledge of the Bible and Christian theology is prepared to do. To furnish the church with ministers who will not simply entertain but instruct and educate their people out of and in God's Word, and be true "doctors of divinity", teachers of divine things—this is the high mission of a theological school to its church. And many are the churches and congregations that are calling loudly for such ministers.

I venture to predict that during the next fifty years of your history no chair in your entire curriculum will do more to train your students for effective service in saving souls and building up the church than this latest addition to your course of study, the chair of Religious Education and Sunday School Pedagogy.

CALVINISM AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

BY CHARLES R. HEMPHILL, D.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS IN THE PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF KENTUCKY.

What propriety, you may ask, is there in discussing this topic in celebrating the jubilee of a Baptist seminary? It may be answered, for one reason, that the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of John Calvin fell on the tenth of July of this year, an anniversary widely recognized and celebrated in various ways, notably by laying the corner-stone of a magnificent monument to his memory in the city of Geneva, the scene of his labors. A further and better reason is that the great Baptist denomination is and has been predominantly Calvinistic in theology. What is known as the Philadelphia Confession, probably the most generally accepted and influential statement of Baptist theology, is but the Westminster Confession with certain modifications which do not affect the scheme of doctrine. Because, therefore, the attention of the Christian world has been turned for some months to John Calvin, great thinker and theologian and most potent factor in our modern life, and because the doctrinal system that carries his name is the prevailing theology of the Baptist denomination, it is evidently appropriate to consider what Calvinism has done for social progress.

Calvinism takes its name, of course, from John Calvin, though its doctrine of predestination was the teaching of the great Latin Father, St. Augustine, who had many successors in the maintenance of the same doctrine among the theologians of the Roman Catholic Church. Of Calvin himself, only a few words can be said. He was a Frenchman, born in Picardy, July 10, 1509, and sprang from a family of good position. His education was thorough on its academic and classical side, and he received training for the law under the

best professors of the time. Calvin was distinctively a student, and had he been left to his own inclinations he would never have become the leader of a state or the practical Reformer. He preferred "the still air of delightful studies" to the turmoil of directing and controlling the forces of a movement for the overthrow of an old system and the inauguration of a new. Under the promptings of conscience and in obedience to what he deemed a call of God, he surrendered his own wishes and purposes and entered on a career of leadership from which he often sincerely desired to be released. Calvin's character and motives have received scant justice in popular estimation. He had not the popular qualities of Luther, and made much less impression on the popular imagination. It was his mission to organize Protestant doctrine into a system on the basis of the Scriptures, to elaborate a doctrine of the church that in its unity and consistency could be set over against the Roman Catholic doctrine, to infuse moral energy into the Protestant constituency, and to compact it by a moral discipline. In accomplishing his mission Calvin produced the immortal *Institutes of Religion,* wrote commentaries on almost all the books of Holy Scripture, which still hold high rank for grammatical accuracy, historical sense and spiritual insight; preached, lectured; in the face of powerful opposition constituted Geneva something like a model state and a model church; made this little, obscure city of Switzerland the Rome of Protestantism, the refuge of persecuted Protestants, the school of the Reformed faith. Through his writings and his teaching of his students and his correspondence, Calvin exerted an influence on his contemporaries to which I know of no parallel in history. Renan gives the only explanation of this influence when he tells us that "Calvin succeeded, in an age and in a country, which called for reaction toward Christianity, simply because he was the most Christian man of his generation".

Calvin would have deprecated the giving of his name to a system which he drew from the Holy Scriptures and which he believed to be the truth of God. And we should remember that this designation does not belong to the period of Calvin himself. The differences between the two types of Reformation

doctrine, which consisted chiefly in their views of the Lord's Supper, were indicated by the terms Lutheran and Reformed. The term "Calvinism" has, however, attained a position among us, and is not likely to be put aside in favor of Augustinianism, as Dr. Charles Hodge has sought to do.

What, then, is Calvinism? Its central doctrine, its organizing principle, is the sovereignty of God. This sovereignty is not the sovereignty of any one attribute, but of God in the unity of all his attributes: much less is it the sovereignty of naked will. Nor is this sovereignty exercised arbitrarily: God always has his reasons, though they may not be revealed to his creatures. This sovereignty embraces all spheres of God's activity, creation, providence and redemption; it embraces all creatures and all their actions. To put it in another way: through the ages one increasing purpose runs; this is the purpose of God and it marches to its consummation in accordance with a plan. This plan includes the free activities of men and this purpose is fulfilled through men without impairing their freedom. It should be kept in mind that Calvinism accepts all the doctrines set forth in the ecumenical creeds of Christendom, and it would be, therefore, a mistake to limit Calvinism to the so-called Five Points, much less to the one Doctrine of Predestination or the Sovereignty of God. What Calvinism does is to gather up the various doctrines of Holy Scripture and organize them into a system under the unifying principle of God's sovereignty. Calvinism is, however, more than a doctrine. It develops from the Scriptures a complete ethical system and proposes to train the Christian man into the highest moral character. In the larger catechism of the Westminster Divines is embodied a minute and comprehensive system of Christian ethics.

Calvinism also presents a form of Church Polity and Discipline and Directory of Worship. Of these I can only say that Calvin's conception of the church is catholic and liberal; and the Westminster Divines summed it up in the statement: "The visible church consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion together with their children."

But what is social progress?

This would appear to mean the development of man in his essential character and in the improvement of his environment and in the growth of what we know as civilization. Religion is the chief factor in molding character, in enlarging the horizon of man, in providing and in producing civilization. This progress I take to invlove and to be conditioned by man's consciousness of personality, or individualism, and the free, full and rounded development of the individual. This will involve development of institutions, religious, political and social, but these will have their meaning and value in relation to the individual man. "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath;" these emancipating words of Jesus might be a universal formula for all institutions.

Calvinism makes man vividly conscious of his personality and his individual relation to God. Its doctrine of the relation of God and man is that of immediacy. It allows no intermediary, it brushes aside all human and angelic mediators, it abolishes the intervention of a human priesthood; it abases man, it is true, by reason of his sin, but exalts him through grace to be a son of God with free access to the presence of his Father, and constitutes him a king and a priest.

It is surely more than a coincidence that where Calvinism has prevailed men have taken on a marked individuality: witness the Dutchman, the Scotchman, the Puritan Englishman, the New England Puritan, the Huguenot, the Scotch-Irish.

Calvinism can lay no exclusive claim to this. We recognize it as a fundamental principle of Protestantism. It is enshrined forever in the heroic words of Luther at Worms: "Here I stand. I can do no other. God help me." Calvinism, however, gives a special emphasis to this consciousness of personality, the absolute dependence of man on God, and man's immediate responsibility to God.

But personality expresses itself in institutions, and acts and reacts on the social order. Social progress will, therefore, be measured by the institutions through which man expresses and develops himself. Let us sketch, therefore, the nature and effects of Calvinism in respect to the social life of mankind.

The family lies at the basis of social order and conditions

social progress. Calvinism puts emphasis on the family life. To the parents it assigns authority, and upon them lays serious responsibilities. At the center of the home is the religious worship of the household, a worship that has found its literary expression in the "Cotter's Saturday Night". To this is added instruction in religion through the study of the Holy Scriptures and through the Catechism; and united with worship and religious teaching is a discipline that brings obedience and order and trains to manliness and self-control and all the virtues of characters, strong and gentle. Mr. John Richard Green, the historian of England, tells us that "Home, as we conceive it, was the creation of the Puritan", and the Puritan, as we know, was a Calvinist. The Christian home, the finest social product of Christianity, has found in Calvinism a system that promotes its sanctities and shields it against its enemies.

We turn to the church, an institution that so profoundly affects social progress. In Calvin's doctrine of the church we may note three principal ideas: the alone Headship of Jesus Christ, the power of the church lodged by Christ primarily in the people, and the church's independence of the state. By reason of political conditions in Geneva Calvin was unable to give full effect to these ideas in the Genevan church. In the Reformation period they found fullest and most consistent expression in the church of Scotland under his friend and pupil, the redoubtable John Knox. These ideas have steadily gained ascendency and may be said to be at this time in practical supremacy among most of the Protestant bodies of Christendom. But this ascendency has been won at heavy cost. The history of the Church of Scotland, for instance, from the days of Knox until our own time, a history marked by struggle and sacrifice and martyrdoms, revolves around these three principles, and especially the Headship of the Lord Jesus. From these principles it is easy to see that the church must have a distinct organization independent of the state, and that her polity must recognize the Kingship of Christ over the church and the seat of church power in the people as a whole. From these principles you can derive a republican or a democratic polity; then you can construct a republic in which the people exercise their

power in the free election of their officers, to which as their representatives the administration of church power is committed; or you can construct a democracy in which the people directly exercise and administer the power of the church. Calvinistic churches have followed both modes of organization, and they are represented today by the republic of Presbyterianism and the democracy of the Baptist denomination, not to mention other Christian communions. It is obvious that under the operation of these polities the people develop a sense of responsibility, a familiarity with practical affairs, a trained judgment, a self-restraint, that have an immense influence on all the elements of the personality and that strengthen and broaden individual character. The church becomes a training-ground for drawing out and developing social forces that not only react upon the individual, but affect all social institutions. We shall see some results of these polities in considering the relation of Calvinism to the state and to political institutions.

Calvin held a high doctrine of the state. It was simply the doctrine of the Apostles Paul and Peter. The state is a divine institution and its sanctions are sustained by a divine ordinance. Calvinism, however, had no political program. Calvin's polity for the church was not based on any political principles he may have held, but was derived by him from the Scriptures and enforced by him on their authority alone. It was inevitable, however, that men accustomed in their church government to the working of republican and democratic principles would begin to inquire whether these principles ought not to obtain in civil government. Especially would this be the case when a despotic or monarchical state became oppressive and robbed the subject of his civil or religious liberties. The man who imbibed Calvin's doctrine of man and his immediate relation to God, and his consequent rights, and who was trained in the ecclesiastical school of free institutions, could not surrender without a struggle his liberties and rights in the state. It has turned out as we might have been led to expect. Modern civilization and modern social progress have been brought about by the victorious advance of free institutions and of the liberties of mankind. And it must be the verdict

of unprejudiced readers of history that it is the Calvinist who has been in the vanguard, who has borne the brunt of the struggle, who has done most and suffered most for the common cause of humanity. The pen of the historian traces no pages more eloquent than those in which he tells the story of Calvinism's battles for liberty and for government by the people and for the people. What a glorious chapter is written in the tragic and unsuccessful struggles of the Huguenots of France! And our own Motley has given us the history of the Calvinists of Holland, who, after eighty years of war, in which they displayed a courage unmatched in the annals of mankind, and endured sufferings incredible, and martyrdoms almost without number, at last won their freedom from Spain, and gave to the world an example of republican government and of religious toleration. "It is impossible," says Motley, "to calculate the amount of benefit rendered to civilization by the example of the Dutch Republic".

The liberties of England were achieved by the Puritans, who were almost to a man Calvinists. It was the Puritan who carried on the long war against the Stuarts with their doctrines of the divine right of kings and the passive obedience of the subject. In this bitter struggle the Puritan was the soldier of humanity and his victory was the triumph of the liberties of mankind. "It is not too much to say that in the seventeenth century the entire political future of mankind was staked upon the questions that were at issue in England. Had it not been for the Puritans, political liberty would probably have disappeared from the world." These are the words of our brilliant American historian, John Fiske. Time will not allow me to speak of Canvinistic Scotland's contributions to free political institutions, or the influence of Calvinism in other countries. Of one country, however, I must speak, though I may do little more than name it. What government is it that today marks the utmost verge of man's long struggle for freedom and the right to govern himself by laws of his own making under responsibility to God alone? It is the Republic of the West, the marvel of modern times, rather of all times. Who fought the battles of the Revolution and gained the independence of the colonies?

Chiefly the Congregationalists of New England, the Huguenots of the South, the Dutch of New York and New Jersey, the Presbyterians and the Baptists throughout the land—Calvinists all. It is estimated that "more than one-half of the officers and soldiers of the American army were Presbyterians". If Canvinists were the chief factor in achieving the independence of the colonies, it was their principles that were embodied in the Constitution and form of government adopted by the new Republic. Mr. Bancroft is right in saying: "He that will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin knows but little of the origin of American liberty."

But freedom has never attained its rightful expression until it becomes freedom of conscience and liberty of worship; nor has the individual man reached his loftiest dignity nor found scope for complete development until he can worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. This freedom has never been better declared than by the Westminster Divines: "God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in anything contrary to his Word, or beside it in matters of faith and worship." Unhappily Calvin himself did not fully grasp and apply this principle in all its meaning, and adherents of his system have not always been true to it. Church and state had been so long complicated with each other that the Reformers did not emancipate themselves fully from long prevalent ideas. Calvin's doctrine of the independence of the church in its relation to the state was far in advance of the Lutheran maxim of *"cujus regio, ejus religio",* but it fell short of the principle of separation of church and state. The result of Calvin's defective view is seen in the tragedy of the death of Servetus. For this Calvin is often held solely responsible, but unjustly so. He cannot be acquitted of serious blame and large responsibility, and his conduct in this case leaves the only stain on the luster of his fame, but it at least should not be forgotten that Servetus was tried and condemned and executed by the civil and not the ecclesiastical tribunal; that Calvin was not a member of the council and that he earnestly, but vainly, entreated the council for a mitigation of the penalty so as to sub-

stitute some other form of death for the tortures of fire. Only by degrees did the mass of Calvinists come to clear recognition and application of the implications of their own principles, but there can be no doubt that the Calvinists of Holland were the first to carry out consistently the doctrine of toleration, and that they and the Puritans of England and the Presbyterians of Scotland fought and finally won the battle for freedom of religion. In this war for the rights of man the Baptists hold an honorable place, going beyond, as they did, the doctrine of toleration and maintaining the doctrine of liberty of conscience and worship. It is in this country that this principle has received its complete expression. And it must be conceded that in the conflict out of which it emerged clearly and victoriously, the Baptists and the Presbyterians were the leaders. It was they who supported Mr. Jefferson in his battle for liberty in religion, which found place in the Virginia Bill of Rights framed by this great statesman. And it was the same influence that put this principle into the Constitution of the United States and gave to the world the full doctrine of the absolute separation of church and state. It may not be easy to divide the honors of this achievement fairly between Baptist and Presbyterian—the Baptist appears to me to have a better claim for initiating the struggle—but there is surely glory enough for each. Thus came to an end in this new world the operation of a principle under which had been enacted for centuries the untold horrors of religious persecution, whose bloody records in every country of Europe make us shudder. None can deny the claim of the Calvinist to have been again the soldier of humanity in carrying on this war and bringing it at last to a glorious end.

Social progress is marked by the spread of education, and here Calvinism takes no second place. There is time, however, only to make briefest mention of its part in education. It is enough to say that Calvin himself was, as his doctrine of man would logically require, the ardent advocate of education. He founded the University of Geneva, and through his influence advanced the cause throughout Protestant Europe. John Knox elaborated and carried into effect in large measure a perfect

system of popular education, and by it made the Scottish people one of the most intelligent and masterful peoples of the world. I must content myself with the declaration of Mr. Bancroft: "We boast of our common schools; Calvin was the father of popular education, the inventor of the system of free schools."

Here I must pause. It has been shown, I trust, that the teachings of Calvinism are of such kind as to promote the growth of individual character and to build religious and social and political institutions in which man will reach the highest development of which he is capable. It is not claimed that Calvinism has been the only force at work in changing the social and political order, but it is claimed, and I think the claim is historically justified, that Calvinism has been a mighty factor in bringing about the conditions of our modern world in which man has had the highest conception of his own dignity, and in which he has largest opportunity for his free development and strongest impulse and motive to achieve his best.

Is Calvinism a spent force? Has it exhausted its mission? I believe it is yet needed; in fact, it is today most potent, and a plea might well be entered for its widespread revival. In religion it is the undaunted champion of the supernatural; in morals the disciplinarian of character; in education the advocate of popular intelligence; in politics the unflinching supporter of free institutions. Its doctrine of God places him on no uncertain throne. From him and through him and to him are all things. Its doctrine of man makes him but a little lower than the angels. "Man's chief end is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever." Man cannot part with these ideas without irreparable loss; with them he can move on to heights yet unattained, to achievements yet undreamed of.

THE PREACHER AND THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY.

BY SHAILER MATHEWS, DEAN OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

I am not a sociologist. I am a theologian, or at least I am trying to be one. Yet I believe that there is much for the minister to gain from the study of society. Not that sociology can replace the Gospel. Whoever thinks that should never be a minister in an evangelical church. The real place of the study of society in a minister's curriculum, both in and after his theological seminary course, is that of assisting him to gain a new sense of his office and a new valuation of his message.

I use the word society in a broad way to indicate a community composed of persons acting together and subject to approximately the same conditions. Its nature has been roughly set forth in terms of an organism, but of late this analogy has been to a considerable extent abandoned and psychology rather than biology has been brought into the service of social thinkers. Yet, however a minister approaches the study of society as distinct from that of isolated individuals, he will find himself coming to appreciate anew the great evangelic truths with which, in Christ's stead, he goes forth, beseeching the world to be reconciled to its God.

I.

In the first place, such study will enable a man to appreciate better the reality and the awfulness of sin.

You cannot save people who do not want to be saved. Jesus himself declared that he was sent to heal not the well, but the sick. One of the greatest dangers that besets our modern world is moral complacency. Sometimes the preacher, especially if he be in any sense in revolt against the older type of preaching, falls under the spell of the temptation to flatter people into the

Kingdom of God. Sometimes he tries to utter literary essays, introducing religious matters, as it were, surreptitiously into his discourse. But the world cannot be saved by stereopticon lanterns. It cannot be entertained into righteousness. Until both the preacher and the people to whom he preaches come to realize that sin is something more than a mistake, that it is a contaminating influence in the social atmosphere, a backward pull within the individual himself, it is not likely that the Gospel will be warmly welcomed. For the Gospel is a message of healing and salvation only to those men who feel the need of such healing and salvation. Jesus has no message for bad men, except the call of Jonah to the men of Nineveh—the call to repentance.

Now, an honest preacher of the Gospel knows only too well the meaning of sin in his own life. He shares with Paul and Augustine, in fact with every religious teacher the world ever knew except Jesus Christ, a sense of the sinfulness of his own soul. And it is his business to arouse this sense of personal unworthiness on the part of all his hearers. This duty is met most effectively when he comes to the study of sin, not only from the point of his own individual experience, but from the study of society as a whole. He sees that sin tends to socialize itself and to perpetuate itself in institutions, and within the entire environment into which men are born and the more intimate environment into which they enter when they undertake to make their living. He sees, too, that sin is not generally committed because it is sinful, but because it is believed to lead to pleasure or to wealth.

Now, pleasure and wealth are by no means identical, but the student of society sees only too clearly that the two often become united, and thus come to present a front that tends steadily to make the work of the Gospel more difficult. The problem of the theater and other forms of amusement is no longer one that can be settled from the individual point of view. They have become great social institutions involving enormous capital and even far more enormous expenditure. As such they are so deeply wrought into our social fabric as to be utterly impervious to the denunciation of individual devotees to pleasure.

When the search for pleasure is commercialized it is one of the most potent of the forces making toward social debilitation, if not actual sin—a sin that is something more than a matter of theological hand-books. A minister who has once studied carefully a section of the city from which householders have been driven to be replaced by saloons, brothels and immoral theaters, does not have to remember definitions of sin he learned in his class in theology. He knows it to be a force that is working its damnable result, ultimately always in individuals, but immediately in communities. He sees that if these individuals are to be saved, something has to be done to check the influences of commercialized vice upon children, as well as upon adults. And thus he comes to face the entire range of problems associated with the family, penology and municipal regulation of social evils.

Further, in the same proportion as his study of society is more than theoretical, does the preacher come to see that the problem of sin has become further complicated by the present tendency in the individual world toward corporation and labor organizations. In fact, there may be said to be growing up a new sort of sin, that of the corporation. As individuals, men and women may be charming fathers and mothers, kindly and even devoted to our churches, but as owners of stock in corporations or as members of labor unions they may connive at, if not indeed participate in, actions which, if not illegal, certainly are contrary to the spirit of justice and love. This is not to say that corporations and labor unions are wrong. It is only to say that they complicate the problem of wrong. The minister who comes face to face with the question of the enforcement of factory laws for the protection of workmen, women and children, comes to see that in our modern life this new sort of sin is one of the most difficult to deal with; even to get defined as sin. But few men, after having faced these facts, can ever be content to treat sin as simply a question of merely individual relations. The very moral indifference of certain corporations and their constant tendency to regard themselves as impersonal combinations, the willingness of labor organizations to justify violence in the name of a noble cause, all alike will compel

him to new activity in stimulating the moral conscience. He will not necessarily attack the corporations or labor unions as such, he may never use the words, but he will so devote himself to the work of moral agitation and education as to make men feel that the laws of right and wrong and love extend wherever men go.

II.

But the preacher will get from his social studies a sense of the impotence of the unorganized individual to combat the social evils which now face the world, and thus we come in sight of the second service that the study of sociology may render the minister. It will give him a new and more effective conception of the church.

I use the word church as a general term without meaning to commit myself to any ecclesiastical theory. In strictness it can be applied only to a body of Christian believers who have united themselves according to the principles of the New Testament. But we all use the word in a larger sense to include the idea not only of these local organizations taken severally, but also in a loose way as a generic term, as a sort of convenient tool for expressing the idea of organized rather than unorganized religious people.

No man who studies society can for a moment deny that religion has a place in social development and that such a place is also to be assigned churches as social institutions. No man has ever been of great significance in history who has not in some way institutionalized his ideals. The church is the institutionalized Gospel. There are doubtless Christian people who, for exceptional reasons, may never join any local body of believers, but speaking generally, they amount to very little as religious forces. Even if they could all be brought together, they would be only a mob. And a mob, however much it may talk and shout and destroy, is not to do constructive work. The Greeks beat the enormously greater armies of the Persians because they were disciplined. The church is the army of the Lord. In the same proportion as it is fulfilling its mission is it

training men and women in efficiency. It is not simply a group of people who have been drawn together by the common hope of salvation. It is rather a group of Christians who are being trained to bring the Gospel to their world.

No one can understand this quite as clearly before as after he has studied the structure of society. He sees various institutions standing for different functions of social life; the state for government, the school for secular education, the courts for justice. But he finds no institution except the church devoting itself to the production of good men and women. There are reform organizations, of course, that endeavor to dispel the works of evil, but the church is unique among the great social agencies in that it actually succeeds in creating, with God's help, regenerate life. Now the student of society, if he be really scientific rather than Utopian, sees that society without regenerate individuals is as impossible as a marble house without marble blocks. He inevitably comes to realize the real need not only of bringing souls into right relations with God, but in grouping them together for more efficient service with God.

The study of society will show the minister, furthermore, that he must unify and concentrate his conception of the real function of the church in society. He will see it is not to undertake every sort of social reform; that one of the chief dangers that beset it is the dissipation of its strictly spiritual energies. I know there are those who believe that the chief object of the work of the church should be miscellaneous reform. Every institution has its critics, and in this particular the church is like the theological seminary. If theological seminaries were to teach all the courses which their critics suggest, the theological student would not get out into his parish younger than Moses escaped from Egypt. And even thus he would be so weakened by the cuisine of his educational house of Pharoah, its table-d'hote of political economy, political science, hypnotism, basketball, religious pedagogy, philosophy, biology, higher criticism, practical athletics, advertising, management of moving pictures and practice of psychotherapeutics as to need another forty years' retirement to recover his balance of mind

and a practical-minded father-in-law to assist him in organizing the people he was trying to lead out of bondage.

Similarly in the case of the church: Its supreme spiritual function is in danger of being obscured by those who would have us see in it, not the body of our Christ, but a reform organization. Far be it from any one of us to minimize the importance of well-directed efforts to make a church a social influence in the way of so-called institutional work. But the minister who thinks his church is successful because it teaches girls to sew and boys to play basketball, and men to listen to political speeches and women to substitute missionary societies for bridge whist, has a very imperfect conception of what the church should do as a social institution. All of these accomplishments are to be commended, but they are no more the supreme social duty of the church than feeding the multitude was the supreme mission of Jesus. In so far as they are the social expression of the religious impulses of Christians, they are highly commendable; in so far as they are the substitutes for the spiritual ministrations of a church, they are dangerous. And no man knows this better than he who, after a careful study of the structure of society, comes to feel that men need God and his salvation if social evolution is to move on toward the Kingdom of Heaven. Unless I mistake, there is a decided need of emphasizing this truth which the study of society brings home in a day when the church is being particularly subjected to criticism. None would say that the church is perfect, but no man who knows churches in any broad way, who studies them from within rather than from without, will fail to admit that, speaking generally, the conscience of the community lies in the church members and that the morality of church members is superior to the average of morality. There are always moral parasites in a community who apparently are as good as those upon whose religious spirit they feed. But if one could imagine what the state of a city would be in which there were no Christian churches, he would then be able to judge the social significance of the church even as it is today. We may well urge our church organizations to wider sympathies, to more sacrifice and to more strenuous endeavor for the

brotherhood of man, but let us not forget that the very reason that we are impatient of their imperfections is our profound conviction that they are the one body from whom such ideals can be expected. For they are, with God's help, producing the raw material, so to speak, out of which all sorts of municipal and social reforms can be created. And this comes to no man so effectively as to him who, after the broad study of society, comes to appreciate what the church, with all its failings, has been to history as its central spiritual force, and what a center of moral ambition and energy it is and even more is becoming today.

III.

In the third place, sociological study will make the minister feel more completely the sovereignty of God and the need of divine help in all his efforts at reform and evangelization.

I must confess that many a time the study of actual social conditions in our great cities fills me momentarily with a sense of despair. So mighty do the forces of evil appear, so universal is the tendency to answer all questions in terms of force rather than in terms of love; so apparently ineffective are the agencies of good as to make one hesitate and at times even to despair. Now, it is at such moments that the minister brings to his social observation the optimism of the Gospel. He sees new meaning in that term which so frequently he has used conventionally—"The Kingdom of God". And more than all does he come to feel the force of the cry of Jesus, "The Kingdom of God is at hand. Repent and believe the good news".

For we cannot trust so-called natural evolution to bring about the salvation we desire. If God be not working in the world, we Christians are indeed in a sorry plight. We have staked our very souls on the belief that we are not laboring in vain, that through the ages one increasing purpose runs and that God is working out that gracious plan we think we see disclosed in history and in particular in our Bible.

But how much more God means to us when we believe that he not only made the world and the universe and mankind,

but that in some way we can as yet only faintly trace, his purpose of love is being wrought out in the world despite sin. The church is his body. And from such a point of view we get a Gospel of new meaning in that bold word of Paul, the church "is the fullness of him that filleth all things". The student of history comes to see this. Benjamin Kidd himself has helped us see it a little more plainly than we saw it before, but most of all does the Gospel itself supplement our social study and give it new meaning. By that study we not only come to feel our greater need of God, but we see also that God is actually working in society as well as in individuals. We cannot minimize the individual. In my opinion salvation stands as a supreme end of all the great history of the race that lies behind us. But nonetheless can we appreciate that whatever God can do with the individual, we must trust him also as he works in that society in which the individual is environed and of which he forms a part.

And to my mind this is the end of the matter so far as the minister's study of sociology is concerned. If such a study does not enable him better to bring God to the human soul, give him a keener appreciation of humanity's needs of the divine salvation, a firmer grip upon the Gospel message of Jesus Christ and a keener perception of the opportunity and the study of the church, it has proved a failure. But I cannot believe that such a failure can ever wait upon an honest search for a meaning in our social life. I have seen too many men brought by such study to deeper seriousness of purpose and more intense spirit of self-sacrifice for Jesus Christ to doubt its efficacy. After every effort I make to apprehend the meaning of social life, its needs and its possible salvation, I find myself saying over again with Paul, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Jesus Christ: for it is a power of God unto salvation"—to the individual first and also to society.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

BY GEORGE E. HORR, A.B., D.D., PRESIDENT OF NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE, NEWTON CENTER, MASS.

The theological seminary, as it is known in America, is a recent institution which has not yet passed out of the experimental stage. Up to the time of the Reformation the main concern of the universities was theological, but the new interests and the new point of view, that originated in the revival of letters and culminated in the Reformation, terminated the primacy of the theological discipline and remanded it to the position of a department of university instruction.

In this country the organization of separate schools for theological study arose from two causes: First, the evolution of the colleges into universities. In this process other disciplines were established before the theological, and, in many instances, the college development did not embrace a theological course. In the cases of Harvard and Yale, however, this was not true, and the theological faculties in these universities became an organic part of their systems.

A second reason for organization of separate schools was that the strong spirit of denominationalism made it impracticable for the college to organize a theological faculty, which would command the hearty support of its entire constituency.

The type of theological school, established under these conditions, was strictly confessional, with a strong apologetic cast in relation to other denominations. The purpose of the school was to train its students for an effective ministry in the denomination to which it belonged. Its curriculum recognized five leading departments of study: the Old Testament, the New Testament, Systematic Theology, Church History and Homiletics. In evangelical seminaries the Bible was, of course, regarded as the inspired Word of God, and there was no appeal

behind it. The average student would not be likely to find that the studies of his seminary course had changed materially the religious convictions which had been instilled by his family life and the instructions of his home church. It had only broadened and deepened them.

In those days seminary students were not, to the extent that prevails at present, college graduates, though the A.B. degree was held as most desirable for matriculation in the seminary. The student, however, in passing from the college to the seminary, was not usually conscious of any change in the methods or ideals of the two schools. The college and the seminary had a common outlook upon the world.

Furthermore, in those days the student, in passing from the seminary to his work as pastor, generally entered upon a situation that was entirely familiar. The industrial and social life in which he served was the one in which he had been brought up. He had the enormous advantage of working in an environment which he understood thoroughly.

It must be evident to anyone who recognizes this account of former conditions as even measurably true, in what a different situation the theological seminary of today is placed. I would like to call attention to three principal forces which have been influential in this change:

First, the method of study in every department of human knowledge has undergone a profound modification. The inductive method has been slowly winning its way in every department of human inquiry since the days of Lord Bacon, but it received a most powerful impulse from the series of discoveries which signalized the nineteenth century. The decade 1870-80 is marked by an intellectual revolution that has no parallel this side of the Renaissance and the Reformation. In this decade the scientific method became supreme in most departments of human thought. This was not the method which had controlled the theological discipline, and many students found in passing from the college to the seminary that they had not only entered a different psychological climate, but that the outlook upon the world and upon life and the tests of truth that prevailed in the seminary were quite different from those to

which they had been accustomed. Gradually, however, the new temper and method entered the seminaries. Today in the best seminaries the young man is conscious of no break between the method of the college and that of the thological school, but he becomes aware of certain limitations of the scientific method, which are too commonly overlooked or neglected in the college. He comes to see that the verifications of experiment in the material world are not the only validations of truth —that there are the verifications of human experience in many ranges, and that the appeal to the spiritual intuitions and to the religious constitution of human nature may be as valid as the appeal to the logical understanding. If the seminary has had much to learn from the scientific spirit in the colleges, the colleges are now beginning to see that they have much to learn from the seminaries, and the question is now frequently put: May not the aridity of our literature, and our dearth of great achievements in art and poetry be traced to a neglect in our educational system of sufficient recognition of the fact that there are other avenues to the human soul besides the five senses strengthened by instruments, and that the method of the laboratory, however satisfactory it may be in its own sphere, does not afford the only tests of spiritual truths? The evangelical seminaries, at least, are performing today an invaluable service, quite apart from their distinctive function, in inculcating an appreciation of the higher values.

A second force which has contributed to this change has been the conception of the world, including human history, as an organism. There have been many definitions of evolution, and many of those who have antagonized one another most sharply with reference to it have had very different conceptions of the theory. But the central pith of the doctrine of evolution, as Dr. John Fiske has pointed out (Essays, II:273), is that the changes that are going on throughout the universe are not chaotic or unrelated, but follow an intelligible course from one state of things to another, and more particularly the course which they follow is like that which goes on during the development of an ovum into a mature animal. The doctrine of the unification of nature, and not any theory of

natural selection or of the derivation of species, is the heart of the evolutionary philosophy. Now it is only fair to say that this conception of a unified nature is absolutely dominant in the world of thought. The genetic conception has superseded the mechanical, and done it so thoroughly that the language and symbols of the man educated fifty years ago are almost unintelligible to the men who have taken their degrees within ten or fifteen years.

The effects of this changed point of view upon theology and upon the theological discipline of course have been prodigious. It is only the latter consideration which concerns us in this survey. Two of these effects are readily discerned. For one thing, the range of theological studies has been enormously broadened. Take for example the history of Israel. Under the new reading of history, whatever our theory of the providential training of the chosen people, the life and institutions of Israel have profound genetic connections with the development of Babylon and Egypt. So as to Christianity itself, its relations with Judaism must be vital, and it can be understood only from the point of view of the preceding history. The real issue between the radicals and the conservatives is not as to the validity of this method of genetic study. The real issue is as to the possibility of accounting for the unique message of Israel by its historic antecedents, and of accounting for Christianity by Judaism.

It is clear that when history or doctrine is studied from this point of view the range of inquiry is enormously broadened. The whole field of Semitic life, literature and institutions must be thoroughly mastered in order to a correct apprehension of the history of Israel. But this is only one field. What is true of it is true of every line of inquiry. In the near future every branch of knowledge will be studied comparatively.

Another result of this conception of unified nature has been to compel the theologian to fundamental thinking. It has thrust metaphysical and philosophical questions into the foreground. The doctrine of evolution, as I have defined it, is essentially metaphysical, and it points forward to some theory of monism. The Scriptures are based upon certain great postu-

lates. They assume the being and personality of God. The doctrine to which we are referring compels inquiry as to three fundamental truths. Is the force behind the mighty on-going of the world process personal? Is there a purpose in the cosmos? If so, is it beneficent, and if beneficent, is it beneficent for the individual? Can we vindicate the great assertion of St. Paul, which, in a single sentence, answers all these questions: "All things work together for good to them that love God"? (Rom. 8:28.)

Jonathan Edwards gave the first impulse to fundamental theological thinking we have had in America. His temper was perpetuated in his great successors, Hopkins, Bellamy and Emmons. Compared with Edwards, Chauncy is as a pleasure yacht to an ocean liner. Edwards does not stay in the sheltered coves or hug the coast. His prow turns to the high seas for a long voyage, fearless of billows or tempest. The theology of America has never lost that note of depth and thoroughness which first sounds in Edwards' treatises on Virtue, on the Will and on the Affections. But in the period before the decade 1870-80 the stream of thought had become much shallower. Since that decade the great vital questions raised by the doctrine that the world is an organism have compelled a return to fundamental thinking, and our seminaries have been compelled to grapple with the deepest philosophical problems.

In doing this the seminaries have labored under two disadvantages which have not yet been overcome. Under the elective system, which prevails in most of our colleges, it is possible for a student to come to the seminary with the A.B. degree and yet be innocent of philosophical training. This state of matters compels the seminary to give instruction in the elements of philosophy. For the most part these courses are concealed in the department of Systematic Theology, but their segregation in seminaries not affiliated with universities is imminent. On the other hand, it often happens that the philosophy inculcated in the college is irreconcilable with the Christian point of view. Then the task of the theologian is quite as difficult as though the student had not studied philosophy at all. These considerations suggest one of the most important problems in theologi-

cal education, the proper correlation of college with theological studies.

But when the college training in philosophy has been adequate the new point of view has brought into the seminary a whole group of studies to which our fathers were strangers, such as the Philosophy of Religion, Apologetics reaching back to the postulates of Theism, and Religious Psychology.

A third force contributing to this change has been the development of a marvelously complex social and industrial life in the United States. Fifty years ago, or even twenty-five years ago, students trained in our seminaries would serve in pastorates in which their work would be among the kind of people with whom they had been brought up and with whose outlooks and ideals they were absolutely familiar. They needed little familiarity with sociology, theoretical or applied. They knew the intimate life of men to whom they were ministering and they could speak directly, as Lord Bacon says, "to men's business and bosoms"; but within the last quarter of a century industrial and social conditions have been profoundly modified, especially in the North, and the transformation is gradually taking place in the South. In New England most of our ministers serve in towns in which from one-third to one-half of the population is of foreign birth. There are broad divisions between the farmers, the tradesmen and the factory workers, and a still broader division between the employers of labor and their employes who are represented in the trades unions. A more complicated situation could hardly be imagined. There has been an insistent cry that the pulpit should keep in touch with the community. No such demand was heard fifty years ago. There was no occasion for it. The pulpit was in vital sympathy with the life of the community. Now it requires a distinct effort and special training on the part of the minister to enter into sympathetic relations with these various groups which the church must reach and serve. It would be greatly to the advantage of most of our New England ministers—and what is taking place in New England is typical of what is occurring throughout the nation—if they could speak two or three lan-

guages; but, apart from that, they need to acquire a most thorough mastery of the modern sociological conception of society and be capable, through an all-embracing sympathy, of visualizing the position and outlook and ideals of the men and women whom they are to serve. This state of affairs has made it imperative that the modern seminary should incorporate into its curriculum a large variety of new studies. Some of our seminaries, in seeking to light up the situation, have established social settlements even, and thoroughly organized the work of giving their students a practical acquaintance with actual conditions.

It is evident from this rapid survey that the theological discipline has been somewhat radically transformed within the last few years. The seminaries have been adjusting themselves to the methods and postulates that prevail in other departments of the educational world. This has been inevitable, and the churches could not resist it if they would.

It may be proper in a closing word to indicate one or two of the perils that beset the present situation.

For one thing the enormous enlargement of the range of studies, closely germane to the theological discipline, tends to divert the student from his supreme quest of gaining through a study of the Scriptures a deep and comprehensive view of his spiritual message. One man cannot master everything. He must choose, and the range of choice is bewildering. There is real danger that the student, in following some attractive by-path, may stray far from the great central Christian truths. All have not withstood this temptation, and we have graduates of our seminaries who are accomplished archeologists, historians, philosophers and sociologists, but have not gained any real mastery of the distinctive Christian revelation. If a main function of the ministry is preaching, real preaching, and not mere lecturing, the seminary is remiss that does not, through its curriculum and through its insistent temper, make its work converge upon clarifying and intensifying the spiritual message of Christianity.

Another peril is that in response to the methods and temper of secular education the seminary may make the tests of the

scientist the only measures of spiritual truth. The supreme correction to this tendency is the personality of the teachers in the seminary. The point of view, the attitude, the spirit of the professor is of primary importance.

The most luminous pages of the New Testament may be studied in a way that makes them as barren of spiritual impression as a proposition of Euclid; or the investiture conflict between the popes and the emperors may be studied in a way that makes an appeal to the sense of the heroic and leads to a large recognition of the nature of the Kingdom of God. Appreciation of spiritual values, intuitions of the truth, cannot be taught by books or lectures. This kind only comes forth by the radiation of personality quickened by self-communion and prayer. Then convictions arise in the soul which are the expressions of personal life and growth. Without such convictions, the outcome of an inner experience rather than of the application of a scientific method to any set of facts, the work of the Christian ministry is vain and hollow.

The actual work of the graduates of American seminaries as pastors, missionaries and spiritual leaders warrants the judgment that these schools, in the face of great difficulties, have not been ineffective in fulfilling their great mission.

FIFTY YEARS OF PROGRESS IN CHURCH HISTORY.

BY ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN THE SOUTHWESTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, WACO, TEXAS.

No new epoch in the study and writing of Church History is marked by the date of the founding of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, though the founding of this institution may no doubt be regarded as marking an epoch in the history of the Baptists of the Southland. Long before the year of our Lord, 1859, the principles and methods which since that date have guided historical study and teaching and writing, had come into effective application and had produced in Germany a literature that endures and will endure. The fresh impulse given to historical studies in general by the Hegelian philosophy, with its profound conviction that no phase of life or thought is fortuitous or insignificant, but that each has its place in the working out of the great scheme of ideas that constitutes the goal of history, had already borne fruit abundantly in the writings of F. C. Baur, Gieseler, Neander and Hase in the field of general Church History, and a good start had been made in exhaustive research work on individual leaders and movements and in local ecclesiastical histories.

Ferdinand Christian Baur survived the beginning of our half-century by a single year, but his distinctive work was done many years before, and he had been influential in directing the studies of several church historians who predeceased him, as well as many that outlived him and extended their activities into the present period. As early as 1824 he had come under the influence of Schleiermacher and gave utterance to the maxim: "Without philosophy, history seems to me dumb and deaf." During the decade 1826 to 1836 the Hegelian philosophy wrought a transformation in his views of religion and history, and he was led to attempt to explain the rise and prog-

ress of Christianity as a process of development in which individual will and initiative had little place, but in which each individual, with his activities, was regarded as the product of other influences and teachings that converged in him. Best known and most objectionable is his application of these principles to Jesus and to primitive Christianity. The "tendencies" of thought to which he ascribed the various books of the New Testament he found more clearly manifest and more perfectly developed in Gnosticism and Manichaeanism on the one hand, and Ebionism on the other. His works on Gnosticism and Manichaeanism were based upon a thorough study of the materials that were available to him and still have their value. His monograph on the *Doctrine of the Atonement,* first published in 1838, and that on *The Trinity and the Incarnation,* published in 1841-3, applied the principles of historical criticism and of development to these important doctrines in a way that greatly influenced all subsequent study of the history of doctrines. It does not fall within my province to define or to criticise Baur's attempt to reconstruct apostolic history on the basis of radical and persistent antagonism between the Judaizing and the Pauline or universalistic types of Christians. Suffice it to say that, in the opinion of some of his most enthusiastic disciples, he allowed the fact of such antagonism to assume before his vision such exaggerated proportions as to blind him to all the rest of the great moving thoughts and interests of the time. His university lectures on the History of Doctrines and on Church History, published for the most part posthumously and just after 1859, are still of some value, though not resting upon so thorough a study of the sources as his works on the apostolic and immediately post-apostolic times.

Contemporary with Baur was August Neander (b. 1789, d. 1850). His great *History of the Christian Religion and Church* had been available for readers of German for twenty-four years, and for five years an excellent translation had been diffusing its light throughout the English-speaking world. A convert from Judaism, deeply religious, deeply philosophical, full of enthusiasm for his newly found faith, he resolved while still a youth to devote his life to knowing and making known

to the profane the one Savior in the one sense, that is, the Lord Jesus Christ as God manifest in the flesh. He was greatly influenced by Schleiermacher and such semi-pantheistic philosophers as Fichte and Schelling, as well as by earlier Platonizing modes of thought. But he became convinced that Schleiermacher made too great concessions to the rationalistic spirit of the time, and he now gave to the New Testament its proper place of supreme authority and devoted much of his time and strength to the study of the early church fathers. His New Testament and patristic studies bore fruit in several valuable monographs. He early resolved to make Church History his life work, and earnestly prayed for divine guidance and preservation from all errors. His earlier monographs, in which his conceptions of Church History and historiography were clearly revealed, constituted a preparation for his *magnum opus*. He became utterly dissatisfied with the pragmatism that prevailed among rationalistic and supernaturalistic writers on Church History alike, with its ascription of undue importance to individual leaders and great public events (councils, etc.), and its tendency to ignore divine Providence and the gradual working out of God's purpose in history. He recognized Christianity as a power not born out of the depths of human nature, but as having its roots in Heaven, in its essence and in its origin exalted above everything that human nature is able to create, as not merely doctrine, but as power and life, a life in which the divine enters into the human and transforms it. The history of the church or of Christianity he looked upon as the history of the permeation of human life with the life that came down from above in Christ Jesus. As the bit of leaven thrown into a great measure of meal brings about fermentation therein, and through its indwelling power leavens the whole, so Christianity as the heavenly ferment brings about in human nature a fermentation that permeates it through and through and manifests itself in life and thought. His maxim *"pectus est quod facit theologum"* ("It is the heart that makes the theologian"), implies that he considered a right attitude toward God and a hearty sympathy with and understanding of his plans and purposes just as essential to a proper understanding of the

meaning of the facts of Church History as it is to a proper understanding of the Scriptures and the divine teachings contained therein; and he was by no means disconcerted by the sneers of his irreverent opponents who stigmatized his teaching as "pectoral theology". The history of the church was for Neander its consciousness of its own life. He regarded Church History in itself, without any doctoring or special effort to make it so, as edifying. He refused to distinguish between edificatory and instructive Church History, considering the errors and perversions of the past, rightly understood and described just as well calculated to edify as pious and heroic deeds and true teachings. The history of the church, rightly understood and written, he regarded as a speaking testimony to the power of Chritsianity, as a school of Christian experience, as a voice of edification sounding on through all the centuries, as instruction and warning for all who will hear. Thus to write Church History was the purpose of his life, and right nobly and successfully did he fulfill the self-appointed task. It is doubtful whether any of us, even in this twentieth century, has attained to a juster conception of Church History or has used more effectively the materials of Church History for the betterment of humanity. It goes without saying that much material is available today that was not available seventy years ago, and it is not claimed that Neander's arrangement of his materials or his literary style are all that could be desired; but I do insist that the student of Church History of fifty years ago, with Neander and Gieseler on his table, was not so ill equipped, even though he was obliged to do without the Church Histories of Schaff, Sheldon, Fisher, Hurst, Möller, McGlothlin, Moncrief and Newman.

Johann Karl Ludwig Gieseler was a contemporary of Baur and Neander (b. 1793). His works had long been available in German when this institution was founded and an English translation had already appeared. The excellent edition of Henry B. Smith was in course of publication. Gieseler was in almost every respect the antithesis of Neander. He was not deeply religious, not at all mystical, not at all philosophical or speculative, rationalistic rather than supernaturalistic. Nean-

der was so absorbed in his studies and his religious meditations as to be incapable of managing aright his business affairs, and is said to have sometimes lost his way in going from his home in Berlin to the university, and even to have occasionally forgotten his name. Gieseler was a practical man, always prominent in the counsels of the universities with which he was connected and of local philanthropic institutions. Neander was a celibate, Gieseler was twice married and was the father of twenty-four children. Both became profoundly versed in the sources of Church History. Neander wove into his text translations of pertinent passages in great abundance. Gieseler was content with a bare outline of text without any attempt at literary effectiveness, but fortified almost every sentence with footnote quotations of the documents in their original languages. He intended his work as a handbook for students, and it is still admirably adapted for scholarly students who are not afraid of Latin and Greek. It would be hard to find a writer, even of later date, who attained to as complete objectivity in his treatment of Church History. His supreme desire was not to confirm any preconceived conceptions, but to let the facts speak for themselves.

Karl August von Hase, a somewhat younger contemporary of Neander, Baur and Gieseler, who greatly outlived them all (b. 1800, d. 1890), was too romantic, too poetical, too enthusiastically enlisted in contemporary social reform movements, too successful in popular literature, to become a first-class church historian. And yet he was, during the thirty years that preceded the founding of this institution, and for many years afterward, one of the most popular of church historians, both as teacher and writer. In 1831 he gave his first course on Church History in the University of Jena. At that time the thought struck him of writing a Church History, and the scheme of it appeared before his mental vision with great clearness and impressiveness. With an enthusiasm like that of a poet in working out his conception, he threw himself into the accomplishment of the task, and in three years the work lay finished before him, he says, like a statue from the casting-mould. Those of us who have spent decades on a similar task,

and at the last are deeply conscious of the imperfection of our performance, are inclined to smile at Hase's self-complacency and would expect little of permanent value in a work so expeditiously prepared. Of course successive editions were enlarged and improved, and volumes of more expanded lectures have since been published, but one will look in vain, I think, for real help in Hase's flower-garden of Church History.

Johann Heinrich Kurtz was fifty years old at the founding of this Seminary. By 1849 he had found time, in the midst of his multifarious scholastic and literary tasks, laboriously to compile his *Text-book of Church History for Students,* which in its many editions has proved one of the most successful of manuals, and in its English translation has no doubt tried the patience of many a student of this and other institutions, and produced a conviction that Church History is a dry and uninteresting subject. If the taste of students, rather than the convenience of teachers, had been consulted, it could not have held its place for generations as a standard text. But for a teacher of limited resources nothing could surpass it. He had only to assign twenty or thirty pages for a lesson and the hour would be exhausted by the time he had ascertained the extent to which the various members of the class had mastered the text.

Albrecht Benjamin Ritschl had, at the beginning of our period, just been promoted to a full professorship in the University of Bonn, having distinguished himself nine years before by the publication of his monograph on *The Rise of the Old-Catholic Church.* A second and greatly improved edition appeared in 1857. In 1856 he had definitely renounced the leadership of Baur and he was now to become the founder of a school of thought and a view of Church History that has produced such church historians as Harnack and such dogmaticians as Kaftan.

Johann Josef Ignaz von Döllinger was just sixty years old at the beginning of our epoch, and had been for a third of a century professor of Church History and Church Law in the University of Munich, and he was wielding a mighty influence. He was participating in all of the great controversies that were being waged among Roman Catholics and between Roman

Catholics and Protestants. In his knowledge of Church History he was surpassed by no Protestant of his time, and in polemical skill and force he was unequaled among his church-historical contemporaries. Eleven years before the founding of this institution he had completed his remarkable work on *The Reformation, its Inner Development and its Effects Within the Compass of the Lutheran Confession,* in which, by extended quotations from contemporary writers, Protestant and Catholic, he sought to show in as odious a light as possible the shortcomings of Lutheranism in doctrine and in life. He was too much of a polemicist to be a satisfactory church historian; but I am not aware that he misquoted or garbled in his use of the sources. He was to have thirty years more of fruitful activity and to be the leading figure in the war against ultramontanism with its denial of freedom of thought and its papal infallibility.

Karl Joseph Hefele was fifty years old when this Seminary was launched, but thirty-four years were still to be added to his active and laborious life. Three volumes of his *History of Councils* had already appeared, and the remaining four were to appear at intervals from 1860 to 1874. This was a work of prodigious industry, and was welcomed alike by Catholic and Protestant scholars. Like Döllinger, he contended with all his might against ultramontanism, Jesuitism and the decree of infallibility; but he had become a bishop and felt keenly his responsibility as a church official, and after a long period of hesitation and struggle he finally yielded and made peace with the pope.

It has no doubt been observed that all the names I have mentioned are those of Germans. Were there no Englishmen or Americans fifty years ago that could with propriety be placed alongside of these great Germans? Henry Hart Milman, whose *History of Christianity* was published in 1840, and whose *History of Latin Christianity* was published in 1854-56, comes nearest to making an exception in England. Greenwood's *Cathedra Petri,* though not free from glaring defects, is also worthy of mention as a not inconsiderable contribution to medieval Church History. A real exception might

have occurred in America if Henry Boynton Smith, who studied Church History under Neander and who was professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary, New York, from 1850 to 1853, had not been allured to the then more honorable chair of Systematic Theology. His edition of Gieseler and his *Tables of Church History,* the latter published in 1859, give some indication of what he might have accomplished if he had been allowed to devote the next twenty-four years to our noble science. To be sure, his short period of historical study furnished an admirable and almost indispensable preparation for the teaching of Systematic Theology; but Smith's contribution to his later subject was very slight as compared with what he might have accomplished in his earlier.

Of the Americans who were giving instruction in Church History in theological seminaries and universities in 1859, not one name occurs to me that stands for adequate mastery of the subject or for any considearble service in the promotion of historical study. The fact is that Church History has been treated in a somewhat stepmotherly fashion in most American and English institutions, even up to this good year. No adequate provision has been made for graduate training in Church History such as would fit a young man to enter effectively upon the work of instruction in this department. It has been assumed that a fairly educated man of good parts is qualified, without devoting years to the mastery of the subject, to become the guide of students almost as well trained as himself in this most difficult subject, or at least that he can keep ahead of the students until he can gain some mastery of the subject. I know by experience whereof I speak. An even more objectionable method of filling chairs of Church History is that of robbing pulpits of somewhat scholarly pastors almost absolutely innocent of Church History and without the studious habits that would lead to ulimate proficiency. The one institution that, by reason of its command of resources and its connection with a great university, might have been expected to establish a strong graduate school of Church History has failed to make the most of its opportunity and has apparently shown its lack of appreciation of the importance and dignity of the subject by

putting it under the general control of the Head Professor of History in the university. A few institutions have divided the subject into Ancient and Modern Church History, with a professor for each, and have thus made it possible for the professors to specialize and to give some attention to graduate work. A few institutions have established traveling fellowships, which are available for advanced courses in Church History as well as in other subjects, and some able teachers of Church History have been produced in this way. Unquestionably the past fifty years have witnessed remarkable progress in the quantity and quality of Church History teaching, however far short of the ideal we still fall. If one of my learned friends and teachers could have had his well considered and earnestly advocated way fifteen years ago, instead of a great university in a Western city with most of the theological studies departments of university instruction and free from denominational control, there would have been founded in a great Eastern city a theological university in which the amplest provision would have been made for the study of Church History under conservative denominational auspices. If Baptists fail to take the lead in making the most ample provision for the study of Church History, it is to be hoped that some other denomination or combination of denominations will perform the service and take the honors, so that it may cease to be necessary for those who wish to pursue advanced studies in Church History to resort to German universities for this purpose.

I have left myself time for only a summary of actual achievement in historical research and publication during the past fifty years. It almost goes without saying that Germany has kept well in the lead in church-historical research and in the publication of its results. The second and third editions of the *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche,* founded by Herzog and continued by Hauck, compared with the first, furnished a striking illustration of the progress of Church History, as well as of the other theological sciences. The *"Texte und Untersuchungen",* edited by Gebhardt and Harnack, already constitute a most valuable thesaurus of critical research in the literature of the early centuries. Harnack's

History of Dogma (English translation in seven volumes), his *History of Ancient Christian Literature up to Eusebius,* his *The Mission and Spread of Christianity in the First Three Centuries"* (English translation in two volumes), and monographs too numerous to mention, represent high-water mark in church-historical research and exposition. Almost equally learned and able is Zahn's *History of the New Testament Canon.* No finer piece of church-historical work has ever appeared in any language, completeness of research and literary execution being considered, than Hauck's *Church History of Germany,* whose fourth part of over a thousand pages, which it is to be hoped will not prove the last, reaches only to A. D. 1250. The *"Monumenta Germaniae Historica",* begun in the preceding half century and continued throughout the one whose completion we are commemorating, has made available in critically edited texts much ancient and medieval matter pertaining to the history of Christianity. The publication of complete critical editions of the works of great sixteenth century religious leaders has greatly facilitated the work of the historian in his efforts to understand and make understandable the Protestant Revolution. Periodicals like *"Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte"* have, by furnishing a medium for the publication of the results of learned research, greatly promoted church-historical studies. Series of monographs like *Studies on the History of Theology and the Church,* edited by Bonwetsch and Seeberg; *Collection of Select Source-writings on Church History and the History of Doctrines,* edited by Kruger; *Strassburg Theological Studies,* edited by Eberhard and Müller; *Studies on the History of the More Recent Protestantism,* edited by Hoffman and Zscharnack; the Proceedings of the Berlin, Munich and Vienna Academies, and many other such publications have made valuable material available. The Germans have taken the foremost position in exploiting the rich church-historical materials contained in the Ethiopic, Coptic, Arabic, Syriac, Armenian and Slavic languages, though French and English scholars have shared with them in the labors and the honors.

Even the Anabapists and other radical leaders and parties of

the medieval and Reformation times have come to their own in the eagerness of German church-historical studies for fresh fields and pastures new, and Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Reformed scholars vie with each other in publishing material and in the sympathetic treatments of leaders and movements. But that German church historians have not yet fully attained to the objectivity that they claim for themselves and insist upon in others, is manifest from the fierce polemics aroused by Keller a few years ago, when he ventured to claim that the Anabaptists were only a later phase of a great old evangelical party that was widespread and highly influential throughout the Middle Ages, and was closely connected with apostolic Christianity, while Luther, so far from improving upon this old evangelical type of Christianity, first perverted it in his own teaching and life and then persecuted it to the death, and more recently by Barge, who in his great work on Carlstadt proved that Carlstadt was a far more thorough-going and consistent reformer than Luther, who was greatly at fault in persecuting this noble and heroic Christian scholar.

To the French, Church History is indebted for the Latin and Greek Patrologies, and for several great series of helps to historical and other studies, edited by the Abbè Migne. The Patrologies and the Theological Encyclopaedia (the latter in 171 volumes) have been completed since 1859. French Roman Catholic scholars have edited many medieval and other documents, and have written many important monographs; but I recall nothing in the way of constructive church-historical work that deserves to be ranked with the best that the Germans have done. The same may no doubt be said of Italian and Spanish Roman Catholic work in Church History. French Protestants have furnished us with much useful documentary material and many valuable monographs in the Bulletins of the *Society of History of French Protestantism; Correspondence of the Reformers,* edited by Herminjard; Haag's *Protestant France,* etc.

Neither English churchmen nor English dissenters have lived up to the extraordinary opportunities for historical research presented by the vast collections of materials in the Brit-

ish Museum and other great libraries. Much has been done in British Church History, and especially in local and epochal histories. Many fine ecclesiastical biographies have been published. Interesting monographs on extra-British subjects have from time to time appeared. But, so far as I am aware, Great Britain has not yet produced a single great church historian. Lightfoot and Hatch did some magnificent work in early Church History, as exhibited in the former's great monograph on the Ignatian Epistles, and in the latter's Bampton and Hibbert Lectures. The *Texts and Studies,* edited by J. A. Robinson, is the vehicle for much learned research in early Church History. The *Journal of Theological Studies* likewise furnishes a medium for the publication of newly discovered texts in various languages and for the publication of the results of critical research. The great *Dictionary of National Biography* has done full justice to ecclesiastical leaders of all types of thought and all communions. The *Dictionary of Christian Biography* and the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* are still valuable, but should be re-edited and brought up-to-date. Perhaps the most noteworthy individual British achievement in Church History is Bishop Creighton's *A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome.* Britain shares with America the honor of making available for English readers in good translations with critical notes the writings of the early Fathers in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* and *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.*

And what shall I say of American achievement during the past half century? Having almost nothing to start with, we can surely claim a large percentage of gain. Dr. Philip Schaff, a native of Switzerland, educated in Germany, a pupil of Neander, came to America in 1843 as professor in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, Pa. He had already become well known as the author of a learned work on the Apostolic Church and of several monographs before the founding of this Seminary. His *History of the Christian Church* was begun in 1859 and left incomplete at his death, the volume on the later Middle Ages, which his son is completing, having been omitted (Vol. V), and Vol. VII, scarcely covering the Reformation pe-

riod, being the last. In an extraordinary degree he combined fullness of information with the gift of popular presentation. His *Creeds of Christendom* is equally valuable, with his *History of the Christian Church,* and many minor works attest his industry, enthusiasm and versatility. Even more than by his own writings he promoted the study of Church History by stimulating and enlisting others, and by acting as an intermediary between German and American culture. Bishop Hurst's *History of the Christian Church,* in which the author was ably assisted by Prof. J. A. Falkner and others, is a highly creditable piece of work. Prof. George B. Fisher's numerous writings on Church History have enjoyed and still enjoy an amount of popular favor that must be highly gratifying to the aged author. The most noteworthy American achievement in Church History is, in my humble opinion, the great series of books on Roman Catholic themes by Dr. Henry Charles Lea. For exhaustiveness of research and for sustained intellectual grasp of his subjects in all their relations, for objectivity of the right kind, for sustained power and effectiveness of exposition and argumentation, he is surpassed by no writer of the age in any language, and his works on the Inquisition, Sacerdotal Celibacy, Auricular Confession, Indulgences, etc., are unequalled by works on the same subject. Next to Lea in achievement I should place Dr. Henry M. Baird, whose six volumes on the Huguenots have most of the good qualities ascribed to Lea and constitute a Church History classic. Perhaps I may be allowed to speak of the American Church History Series of denominational histories as on the whole a worthy achievement, although I had the honor of inaugurating it and of contributing a volume. Leaving out the suggestion and omitting from consideration the second volume, I feel free to pronounce the undertaking a fine success and to commend the series for more extensive use than has yet been made of it. Were it not for my editorial connection with the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge,* I should feel inclined to commend very highly this work, now in course of publication, as far more than a condensation and adaptation of the great German Hauck-Herzog, to which I have already

referred, and as to a large extent an independent work in which American scholarship in Church History, as in other departments, is given pretty full scope.

I close with a few suggestions that look to further progress. I have already pointed out the need of a theological university in the United States, where the most eminent church historians may instruct and guide the researches of specializing students of Church History. One such institution would suffice, and I should like to see it conducted under Baptist auspices. It should have a large staff of Church History professors, a large number of Church History fellowships, a library in which all available materials in all languages should be gathered and thoroughly catalogued, and a number of traveling experts constantly employed in discovering and exploiting fresh materials. It should have a large fund for the publication of the results of research; it should publish a *Journal of Church History,* edited with ability similar to that displayed in the *American Historical Review.* Each of our seminaries that has at present only one professor of Church History should aim to add either an assistant in Church History or a second associate or full professor, so that students who wish to specialize in this subject may have all of the help they need, and the professors less heavily burdened with teaching duties may have ample time for research and for literary work. Each of our seminaries should greatly enlarge the Church History department of its library, so that all important books, especially sources, that are likely to be needed, may be readily consulted by professors and students. If the next fifty years should witness as great progress in Church History as the past, the few present today whose privilege it may be to attend the centennial of the Seminary, with its thousand students, its millions of endowment, its score of professors, its hundreds of thousands of books, and its corresponding increase in buildings, will read and hear of the Seminary of today as a small affair, just as we think of the Seminary of thirty-five years ago, with its old brick church, one end cut off for a library and the other end divided into two lecture rooms, a dilapidated frame hotel building for dormitories, four professors actually teaching, and about sixty stu-

dents. But the professors of that day were Broadus, Williams, Toy and Whitsitt, with Boyce in the field for the financial support of the institution. May the next fifty years give us scores of tecahers equal to these and those who have so worthily succeeded them in personality, character, learning and teaching power.

THE PREACHER'S LEADERSHIP.

BY SYLVESTER BURNHAM, D.D., DEAN OF COLGATE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, HAMILTON, N. Y.

As we gladly share with our brethren and fellow-workers in the joy which is justly theirs as they celebrate the close of a distinguished history of fifty years of high success and great usefulness, our thoughts will not unnaturally turn to the consideration of the preacher's leadership. For it has been the aim of this Seminary during these fifty years to train men for the life and work of ministers or servants; and the most perfect servant is the best and truest leader. This, at any rate, is the fact in the church of our Lord Jesus. For he himself, who is at once our King and our Leader, according to his own words, was among us as one that serveth; and of us, who are to follow him, he has said, "he that is chief" among you, let him be "as he that doth serve".

Concerning this leadership of the preacher, many things might be said. We might, for example, appeal to history, and show to what extent the preacher of the religion of our Lord has been the leader in all the great movements of the Christian centuries that have resulted in a richer life, a larger knowledge or greater liberty. Or we might show how the success of the church in its work has always been, and always must be, greater or less, according as the leadership of its preachers has been wise and strong, or foolish and weak. Or we might seek to show what manner of training and what kinds of knowledge will best prepare the preacher for a wise and efficient leadership.

But, for the present occasion, it has seemed best to seek to determine the sphere and the manner of the preacher's leadership. In other words, whom is the preacher to lead, and by what means is he to lead them?

These questions, it is clear, must be answered by means of a

true and definite knowledge of the purpose of Jesus in establishing his church in the world, and in giving to this church a ministry. For his purpose in reference to these matters must be authoritative and decisive. Moreover, his purpose in relation to both these things must be ascertained from the writings of the New Testament. This, at any rate, we Baptists hold; and justly. For, if the purpose of our Lord cannot thus be known in reference to any matter, there does not seem to be any other source from which we might learn about it.

In replying, by means of the information contained in the New Testament, to the former of our two questions, namely, whom is the preacher to lead, it will be well to note in the first place, negatively, that he is not to be a leader of unregenerate men. This is equally true, whether such men are thought of as forming human society in general, or any of the organizations of this society—that is, states, nations, political parties, benevolent brotherhoods, clubs, fraternities and all other like bodies of men. For neither to society at large, nor to any merely human organization within it, does the Christian preacher hold any special or official relation whatever, and his ministerial leadership does not lie in the sphere of the activity of any such organization. This means that, as a preacher, he is not by virtue of his office, and cannot justly be demanded by others to be, a leader in civil life, in political activity, in literary and scientific achievement, or in philanthropic work.

It is, however, to be remembered that a man, by becoming a preacher, does not cease to be a man. Christ calls no man to a lower manhood, and asks of men no service that means a smaller or a poorer life. All that any man may be or do, the Christian man is to be and do, and the Christian preacher is a man surely not less than others. Therefore he may, as well as any man, be a leader in any organization that is intended to secure a better form of life for men, or in any work whose aim is to secure the welfare of either society or the individual, so far as God has given him ability for this leadership, and the duties of his own special and official leadership will allow. But, in such a case, he leads as a man, and not as a preacher; and it would be a fatal mistake to allow the leadership he may

have as a man, to interfere with or make less effective the leadership which he ought to possess as a preacher. For he has a divine call to make it the one work of his life to be a true and faithful minister of the Gospel, a successful preacher of the grace of God. The special obligation cannot be met by doing well other things. For example, it is altogether proper and seemly for a man to be a leader in the game of golf; but a President of the United States, as President, must have some other leadership than this to discharge honorably and well the duties of his high office. It would be the mistake of his life for him, in order to lead the world to the highest possible perfection of his favorite game, as Bill Taft on the golf links, to fail in any measure to maintain the Constitution and execute the laws as President of the United States.

That the preacher, as a preacher, is not a leader of all sorts and conditions of men, nor of any sort or condition of unregenerate men, is shown in one way by the titles which are given to him in the New Testament writings. He is there said to be an elder of the church, a bishop in the flock, one to feed the church of the Lord, one to take care of the church of God; nor is there any other special or official relation of any kind assigned to him in any of the New Testament writings. He is nowhere called the minister of a congregation, of a parish, of a town or of any body of unregenerate people.

His true character as a leader is shown, in a second way, by the kind of duties which are assigned to him. He is exhorted to feed the church, to feed the sheep, to put the brethren in mind of divine truths, to teach them that believe, to take care of the church of God. Nor is there a single duty of another sort which, in the New Testament, he is urged to perform or which is said to belong to him.

Hence, we are now justified in saying, in the second place, positively, that the preacher is a leader of a church, and that his leadership does not extend beyond this limit.

But this means much, and the leadership seems almost limitless when we remember what a church really is and what, therefore, is the end to which the leadership of the preacher should be directed. Without attempting to make a definition

in any formal or complete way, it will set forth the essential truth to say that a church of Christ is a company of regenerate men and women who are working together to secure in the world the realization of the purpose of Jesus, and who are endeavoring, in fellowship with him, to secure by the power of God the coming victory of the Kingdom of Heaven. It is a band of believing souls who are seeking to make the will of God to be done on earth as it is in Heaven. For this they see to be the purpose of their Lord, the end for which he was born, and for which he now lives and reigns, and which stands in his heart, as in his prayer, second only to the love and honor due their Father.

This purpose of Jesus is thus one which may be set forth in two forms of statement, which, however, are the same in meaning. For the Kingdom of Heaven is a Kingdom not of this world, although it is a Kingdom in this world. That is, its life is not a mere modification of the life of unregenerate humanity, not some better adjustment of the aims and motives which underlie and fashion this life, not some better regulation of the self-seeking activities which make up this life; but it is a new and different life, springing from other motives and directed to other ends than those of the unregenerate life, however pure these motives and however high these ends may be. Its motives and its aims are not human attainments, but divine gifts. So the Kingdom of Heaven is not a better regulated and a better adjusted social condition; but it is a new society, the center of which is not man, but God, the aim of which is not the greatest good of the greatest number, but the perfect conformity of every individual to the will of God, and the regulating principle of which is not the wish for a square deal, but the love of holiness. It is a building of God, and not the work of men's hands. It is not an evolution of human history, but a creation of God through the might of his Spirit. It is from above, being the Kingdom of Heaven. Being from above, it seeks to lift up all that is below to the level from which it itself has come, to change the earthly into the heavenly. It does not, therefore, exert itself to regulate the things outside itself, nor to make the old world new; but its endeavor is to change what is out-

side itself into itself, and in so doing not to reform, but to destroy the world that was.

This seems to be the character of the Kingdom of Heaven, as this is set forth in the writings of the New Testament. Nor is it strange that this is so; for, if this were not the Kingdom which Jesus preached, he would not have proclaimed any other salvation, nor held forth any other hope for men than have the founders of the great ethnic religions, and he would not be the only begotten Son of God, but simply one among many sons. But we find him, in harmony with his idea of the Kingdom he proclaimed, making no attempt to right social wrongs, or to show men how they might better get on together and better secure the commonweal, while rejecting his message of salvation, but ever insisting that the single and sufficient condition for a true human life, and for all highest good here and hereafter, is faith in his Gospel and acceptance of his Kingship by a birth from above.

All this, however, is nothing other than seeking to make the will of God to be done on earth as it is in Heaven. For this will is that men should believe on the Son of God and thus have eternal life.

Consequently, in whichever of the two ways we state the purpose which shapes the life and work of Jesus, we see it is not the improvement of an unregenerate and irreligious world, but the creation of a new world, a society of immortals whose meat and drink it is to do the will of God.

Now the church of Christ is at once the beginning of the perfect Kingdom which Jesus preached, and also the agency by which the perfection of this Kingdom is to be realized. The one great and all-absorbing endeavor of the church ought to be, therefore, the perpetuation, the improvement and the increase of itself. Its one aim, in relation to the world outside of itself, will be to bring this world within itself, to transform human society into a heavenly society. Hence, it is not to concern itself with solving the problems which the existing social order presents, nor with mitigating or preventing the wrongs which are the natural results of a civilization that is essentially selfish, nor with securing a square deal from those whose con-

stant purpose is to deal unfairly, nor with making useless the efforts of men to rob their fellows of life, liberty or opportunities of happiness; but its concern will be so to change the hearts, the motives, the aims and the lives of men, that they will form a world in which all such problems, wrongs, purposes and efforts will be both non-existent and impossible. The business of the church is not to solve problems nor to improve conditions, but to destroy them.

In saying all this, it is not to be understood that there has been expressed any opinion as to the duty of Christian men and Christian ministers in relation to the social conditions in which they find themselves as citizens of a state and a society which consist for the most part of unregenerate men and women, and with which this state and this society must somehow deal, and Christians in common with their fellow-citizens. It is quite foreign to the present purpose to discuss what it may be needful or wise for Christians to do for the welfare of unregenerate humanity besides seeking to secure the regeneration of every individual member of it. No attempt can here be made to answer the question how far it may or may not be the duty of the Christian citizen, as a fellow-citizen with sinful men and women in the same political body and the same social order, to investigate the origin and the laws of different social conditions, to study the great science of sociology and to give time and effort to the betterment of the existing social state. Still less is there any thought of saying how far the Christian minister as a citizen of the state ought to be a social reformer; and how far, therefore, the science of sociology ought to find a place in the theological curriculum. What is claimed is that the church of Christ as the beginning of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the agency divinely appointed for securing the perfection of this Kingdom, has as its own work among men the creation of a new world and a heavenly society, which are to be brought into being, are to be made to grow in excellence and in extent and are at last to be made perfect by the Spirit of God abiding and working in the souls of individual men and women. Thus the society which it is the business of the church to create is to be formed, not from without, but from

within. It is not to be produced by the external pressure of power or law, but by the direct and immediate communication from God to the souls of men, of life, powers and graces. The church, in its own work, is not to be a helper in the name of sociology, but a worker of miracles in the name of Jesus. In its method and spirit it is constantly to repeat the apostolic age.

From this one great work of the church Christian men and women should not allow themselves to be diverted by any other work, however good, or by any other duties, however pressing they may seem to be. Nor should they allow other work or other duties to make the work for the Kingdom of Heaven less earnest, less exclusive or less effective. For to the Christian, as there is one Lord and one faith, so there is one work.

What is thus true of the Christian man in general is still more emphatically true of the Christian preacher. For, as we have seen, it is to be a leader of a church of Christ as a beginning and an agency in the Kingdom of Heaven that he has been appointed according to the purpose of Jesus. He leads the disciples of his Lord toward a new world and a heavenly society, a world not reformed, but regenerated.

It is to be noted, however, that, in making the will of God to prevail, the church is to strive to increase the goodness and beauty of its own life, as well as to enlarge its borders. For the will of God is that man, not only in one respect, but in all respects, should be perfect, even as his Father in Heaven is perfect. So the true preacher will lead his church to the possession of every good that enlarges, enriches and beautifies human life, to every activity that elevates and dignifies human nature, as well as to the attainment of every grace that adorns and glorifies the Christian character.

We come now to answer the second of our two questions, namely, by what means is the preacher to lead his church? To this question our only source of information, the writings of the New Testament, returns no uncertain answer. From these writings it is clear that the preacher's leadership is to be discharged by the teaching of the truth, the Word, which is made effective to those who are taught, in the form of life, of character and of work, by the Spirit of God. It is not, it must

be noted, truth in general or truths of all kinds which the preacher is to teach, but *the* truth, the truth of the Kingdom of Heaven, of which the church is the beginning and for the coming of which to its own in the world the church has been established. It is the truth concerning God and Christ, sin and salvation. This truth the preacher is to teach constantly and everywhere; not merely by a sermon on Sunday, but in season and out of season; not merely before the great congregation, but from house to house. Wherever men need to be given the cheer of a good hope, or need to be lifted into greater purity of life, or higher beauty of character, or need to be aroused into a more diligent or a more worthy activity, there will the preacher teach the truth of the Kingdom. By this truth, made living and powerful by the Spirit of God, will he lead his people into a glorious hope, a sweet and radiant life, a holy character and a blessed and blessing work.

The truth he is to teach is that which he will find, and find only, in the Holy Scriptures. For these, and these alone, are the books of the Kingdom. They contain the only credible and trustworthy information which can be had concerning the divine preparation for the Kingdom, the establishment of it in the world, the source and the laws of its life, the destiny which awaits it, the work which it demands from every church and the means and the manner of this work. Moreover, they have been produced within the Kingdom by the inbreathing Spirit of God through his revelation of the mind of God to the souls of men. Thus has the Spirit who gives the Kingdom of Heaven its life, its power, its progress and its final completeness, made provision for the coming of it to its appointed destiny.

It is only in the Holy Scriptures, therefore, that the preacher will find the truth he is to teach, and by which he is to lead, whatever aids he may employ for the better teaching of the truth. But not only is all the truth he is to teach to be found in the Scriptures, but he is to teach all the truth which they contain. It would be both hazardous and wrong for him to select from them for his work merely the truth which he might think to be the truth of the Kingdom, or, in other words, that which he might judge to be Christian in them. For then he

would assume to be the judge and the law-giver for his fellow-citizens of the Kingdom. The certain result would be that there would be within the Kingdom of Heaven not only different theologies, but also different religions. For personal religion, the life of God in the human soul must be more or less determined in form and character by a man's knowledge and belief. Or else personal religion is no more a matter of personal desire and volition than the physical life or the phenomena of nature. But such a conception would be a part of a fatalistic doctrine, beside which Calvinism would seem like a scheme of complete self-determination. For, on the phenomena of the physical life and the world of nature, we may found explanations and base sciences which do not and cannot in any way precede these phenomena; but theology or the science of religion, however unscientific the form of it may be, must in substance precede to a large extent the fact of the religious life at every stage of its development, although it may afterwards give an explanation of this life in a more scientific form. Otherwise, we exclude from the religious life all voluntary coöperation with the Spirit of God. Since there can be no voluntary working by man in either body or soul which does not depend upon, and is not conditioned by, previous desire, belief and knowledge, therefore, different theologies will in the end mean different religions, these being more or less unlike in the same degree as are the theologies which produce them. But if every preacher may take from the Scriptures such material as he may choose from which to fashion his theology, and thus may come to teach a theology of his own and lead men to take his religion for their own, a united church will be an impossibility, the preachers of the church will, as a body, lead nowhere, and the conquest of the world of heathenism by the Kingdom of God will be a hopeless dream. The preacher's leadership will then have no value for either God or man.

Far different is this leadership as it appears in the writings of the New Testament. Here we see the preacher guiding and inspiring the church of the living God with its one faith, as well as its one Lord, by the quick and powerful Word of God, which abides forever in the doing of the greatest and the grandest

works possible for men. He is a leader in the doing of that which only the Son of God, conscious of his almighty power, could even dream of accomplishing among men. This is no less than the transforming of this present sinful world, groaning under its burden of sorrow, anguish and tears, filled with hate, lust and pride, into a new world of righteousness, glorious in its joy, radiant with love and holiness, and the creation of a heavenly society of immortals born from above, whose meat and drink it will be to do the will of God.

THE SCHOLARLY ELEMENT IN THE MINISTER'S LIFE.

BY JOSEPH LEEMING GILMOUR, B.A., D.D., PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN M'MASTER UNIVERSITY, TORONTO, CANADA.

The subject that you have assigned me is "The Scholarly Element in the Minister's Life", and I am bound to say that of all the subjects on the list this is that which I should myself have chosen had you put the choice into my own hands. In looking at this title which you have supplied one can see that there is another topic which might be stated in almost the same words, by slightly changing their order. We might, that is to say, discuss the ministering element in the scholar's life, and for some audiences that might afford most profitable material for consideration. Scholarship should ever minister, and if it does not minister there is a strange and subtle but inexorable law that makes it cease to be even scholarship. That, however, is not what we are to discuss this evening, for our theme is not the ministering element in the scholar's life, but rather the scholarly element in the minister's life. For if the scholar sometimes forgets that he should minister, the minister also sometimes forgets that he should, so far as he can, be a scholar; and the people, too, who are interested in the work and preparation and calling of ministers sometimes forget it quite as seriously. Our subject, therefore, lies very near to the very foundation of that work which you and all the rest of us who are in like service are seeking to do to the education of those who are to be our ministers.

But it is not easy, after having undertaken this subject, to decide first how to approach it, for there are many possible ways of doing that. I have, however, after careful thought, decided to enter this theme by a Biblical pathway. There is in the Bible such finality, such a mellow convincingness, such a sweet peace and satisfaction, that I cannot resist the temptation

to lead up to our subject by that way rather than through the more rugged and perhaps more imposing pass of philosophic or of classical erudition.

Now it is worthy of remark, and even of the most serious and careful consideration, that the two great men in Bible history who more than all others (our Lord alone excepted) dominated by their commanding spiritual genius what we call the two dispensations, were men who had the most careful training in the best schools that were available in their time. Moses in the Old Testament and Paul in the New hold a place that is not quite approached by anyone else. If either of them had a peer in this respect it was Moses, but in this case the principle would still remain intact, for Isaiah also was a man of superb scholarship. With the case of Moses, however, we cannot go this evening, for we have chosen rather to discuss Paul, and our theme really becomes—the debt that Christianity owes through the Apostle Paul to higher learning. The implication here is that what the Lord has in this case written so conspicuously at the beginning of Christian history, must apply to the whole length of its life-bringing course. We ought, however, to state quite clearly at the very outset, what no sensible man will ever deny, that trained scholars are not the only instruments in the Lord's hands for working out his purposes of grace. It is part of his plan that workers of all kinds are used and are needed, and this law has many marvelous applications that only make us admire the more the riches of his wisdom. But while the servant of God who has little learning is, if he is humble, used for his own purposes and in his own way by the great Master, we should be very foolish indeed if we permitted this fact to blind us to the large and important place that the Lord has given to consecrated scholarship. There is, to be sure, no place in the mind of a sensible man for scholarly snobbery, even if it wears a Christian garb; but while it is true that an illiterate worker fully surrendered to the will of his Master will achieve for the Kingdom more than the most accomplished scholar who is not thus surrendered, it is also true that in the broad pages of Christian history we read most distinctly the lesson that God has given a large place—and in its kind an in-

dispensable place—to consecrated and humble Christian scholarship. This we must now seek to make clear from the life and power of the Apostle Paul.

Of all the merely human personalities of the New Testament there is not one that at all approaches the Apostle Paul for the variety and subtlety of his gifts, nor for the consequent influence that he has exerted on all subsequent Christian life and thought. Whether we have regard to the richness of his mind and experience, or the breadth of his horizon, or the variety of his interests, or the clearness of this vision, or the fertility and suggestiveness of his thinking, or the keenness of his discrimination, or the depth and fervor of his emotions, or the intensity and the massiveness of his nature, or his practical grasp of affairs, or his wisdom in counsel, or his deep and fervent devotional life, we stand back amazed that such a varied combination should ever have been found in one life. Paul has created once for all the classic phrases for much of our devotional life; he has discovered and asserted for all time the essence of the universal Gospel stripped of what was merely the dress of the time; he has lighted in the first century—that great hill-top of Christian history—a beacon-fire of zeal that burns forever as a rebuke to our coldness when the currents of our life run low; he has laid down for all succeeding centuries the principles and methods of mission work in the propagation of Christianity, and he has provided us with the needed terminology for scientific Christian theology, his contribution in which respect we are sometimes slow to remember. He is like the Matterhorn or some other majestic peak in the Alps, which we must view from all sides in order to gain an idea of the whole, each new view making us wonder that the same mountain should have still another side so different from the last. Professor Harnack points out that, because of this very complexity, this great apostle was never completely understood by the people of his own time, and that for one hundred and twenty years afterward only one man—Marcion—understood him, and he misunderstood him. Indeed, this majestic power and creative genius which he possessed have been of late so generously recognized in some quarters that those of us who try to be as conservative as we may sometimes feel called upon to argue against

a view that substantially makes Paul instead of Jesus the real founder of Christianity. We need not, however, on that account, allow to escape us the incidental proof that this view gives as to the overtowering greatness of Paul.

We propose, therefore, to look now for a few movements at the education of this great man, for that is the next essential step in the proper treatment of our subject.

The influences of Paul's early home must never be overlooked by one who would seek fully to understand the man, and those influences would probably appear more important if we only knew more than we do about them. In this sphere, however, we are left almost wholly to conjecture. We know that at Tarsus there was an important Greek university; we know that Tarsus enjoyed Roman freedom and was no mean city; we know that the ideas of Roman law there prevalent must have influenced the life and thought of the citizens; we know that the scenery around the city, both in front and behind, was peculiarly picturesque with combination in the landscape of river and plain and mountain; we know that in the port of Tarsus, which, as in the case of all ancient cities, was some miles away, there was a mingling of peoples from all parts, and that it was one of the great meeting-places of the East with the West; we know that all these things were there about the growing boy, but, although we may feel morally certain that we can see the influence of them all in Paul's epistles, we can offer no unanswerable proof if anyone chooses to challenge us for a logical demonstration. For, however clear we may be in our own minds that the man who was so open to impressions in his maturity must have been open as a boy to these subtle influences that were so prominent in Tarsus, we can never be quite sure just how far the strict rule of his father's Hebrew home shut him off from the ways of the Gentiles, nor how slowly or how quickly this boy opened out into the almost universal sympathy for which he was born. This is a point on which scholars differ and we must not dogmatize. We are, however, on much surer ground when we give a real place to the Hebrew synagogue and the Hebrew home in Tarsus to which the young Saul belonged. He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, that is, a Hebrew

from a long line of strict Hebrew ancestors, and the influence of that synagogue and of that home never left Saul of Tarsus.

But the Hebrew father must soon have detected signs of great ability in his growing son, and the Hebrew mother, if she still lived, probably saw these signs earlier than her husband. Now the spell of that strange city perched on its high ridge in the sacred land had never died out of the heart of Saul's father, even in Gentile Tarsus, and so to Jerusalem the boy must go to secure the training that devout Jewish parents considered more important than anything else they could give their children. We shall probably not be very far astray in picturing to ourselves this boy of many hopes and of great promise, leaving at the age of somewhere between ten and thirteen for the Holy City, about which he had read in Scripture history and sung in Hebrew psalms, although we cannot stop now to state the reasons for assigning that age. Whether the first part of the journey was by sea or by land we cannot tell, but in either case the last stage would be practically the same and between Caesarea or some neighboring place, and Jerusalem, Saul would pass over that road which was afterwards to become so familiar to him as a man. He would catch sight of the hills about Jerusalem and enter the city to begin a new and eventful phase of his life's history. At that very time there were in Galilee other boys playing around the lake or perhaps taking their early lessons in the art of fishing, and there was at Nazareth a Boy, perhaps now a young man, learning the trade of a carpenter—the most wonderful Boy the world ever knew.

But Saul of Tarsus was thinking of but one thing, and that was the schooling he was to have at Jerusalem. I cannot think of this without emotion. Here is a boy growing up to get ready for he knows not what, and growing up in obedience to that unerring will of God that always knows how to train the right worker for the right work. We can never tell what is going to happen when a young man comes up to a school of higher learning from the home that has sheltered him up to this time. The autumn days that send our young people flocking from our farms and our towns to the seats of learning are days

that hold in their keeping great secrets that only the coming years will reveal. It is ours to stand by with reverence, and to watch the workings of God and to act, if we may, as servants of his will in this great task.

Saul's teacher at Jerusalem was Gamaliel, and it is very important for our present thesis to remember that Gamaliel was the greatest Jewish scholar of his day and one of the very greatest that the Jewish people have ever had. That the great leader and organizer of Christian life and thought should be trained by such a man is of itself a fact worthy of the most prolonged consideration, for there is in it food for almost endless thought. Gamaliel was noted for his candor and honesty of judgment; he proved his breadth of sympathy and his hospitality to thought from any quarter by his willingness to study and use Greek; and at the same time he was known to cherish the most ardent enthusiasm for the Jewish law. The breadth of sympathy possessed by Gamaliel has indeed been made an argument to prove that Saul of Tarsus cannot have been a pupil of his, because Saul, when he left school, was intensely Jewish almost to narrowness and bigotry. But this argument is hardly valid. Pupils seldom are an exact reproduction of their masters, and they may take perhaps years to work out the principles that their masters inculcate, even when they work them out at all. And then, besides being an erudite scholar with enthusiasm for learning, Gamaliel was an ardent educator with enthusiasm for teaching, as keen to see promise in his pupils as those Scottish school-masters whose greatest joy has been the discovery and training of "lads o' pairts". It was this rare combination in Gamaliel of the scholar and the teacher that made Paul's debt to higher learning so conspicuous.

Of the curriculum through which the youth from Tarsus passed, we may form a very fair general idea from the available literature of the time. For one thing, there would be exegesis and other phases of interpretation, that is, drawing out from a passage the truth that is in it—an art that is rarer than some imagine, and more difficult to acquire than we might suppose. For this course he would have linguistic work in Old Testament Hebrew as well as in Greek, for the ancient Hebrew would in

some sense be a foreign language to him. He would have training also in the study of words, turning them over and interrogating them to make them yield their meaning. Words are more sacred things as deposits of thought than we sometimes imagine. Besides that, he would be drilled in the disengaging of great ideas and conceptions from the language which as a vehicle carried them. Then, in addition to exegesis, there was in these Jewish schools training in the systematic statement of doctrine. This was a very prominent element in Jewish religious education. Indeed, the curriculum tended to become one-sided by reason of a too exclusive emphasis on this department, and the disputations in which the various schools took part against one another in the synagogues of the city were carried on chiefly in the interests of a systematic ordering of theological thought. But beside exegesis and systematic doctrine there was history—certainly the history of the people and, since Gamaliel was the master, no doubt also the history of the great Gentile nations. The proof for this part of the curriculum is not so clear as that for the others, but Paul's epistles give ample evidence of power to make magnificent use of history. There were also practical sides to Saul's training—training in composition, or the power to express ideas, training in meeting and in estimating men, and training in the way to approach the understanding of his own times. The practical grasp of Gamaliel, whose sagacity is shown in the *Acts,* made him a master here also. But besides these four special departments there were two other general dierctions in what Gamaliel led out his pupils. One was the power to see what is really important. The value of this gift is so great that one is sometimes tempted to say that the difference between an educated and an uneducated man is just this power to distinguish between which is important and which is not. This gift Paul possessed to a remarkable degree. He sometimes, in a surprising way, passed over things that others might be distressed over, and sometimes he saw a principle at stake where the matter involved seemed outwardly trivial, but his correct judgment of true values saved many a situation. The other general gift that he developed was the ability to use his own

judgment and to do his own independent thinking when occasion called for it. This, too, is one of the marks of a truly educated man. It was here, however, that Jewish education was perhaps weakest, for it tended to be merely the providing of a great funnel through which the stored-up grain of knowledge was poured into the minds of the receptive pupils. But the avoidance of this mistake was one of Gamaliel's chief distinctions as a teacher, and few parts of our education are more valuable than this. It is far more important to lead a pupil to think for himself than to cram his memory with multitudes of facts, the significance of which he has never realized. It is far more important to help a pupil to make up his own mind on a vital matter of doctrine than to teach him a long list of names that support this or that view. It is far more important to teach a pupil to see for himself the beauty of literature than to make him learn like a parrot the appreciations of even the most approved critics. I know a father who, in looking over the school reader of his little boy, came to page containing a few verses which began:

"Grandpapa's hair is very white,
And grandpapa walks but slow;
He likes to sit in his easy-chair
While the children come and go.
'Hush! Play quietly,' says mama,
'Let nobody trouble dear grandpapa.'"

At the foot of the page, in a school-boy hand, was written in pencil the word "faveriot". And the heart of the father was glad. It was not that there was any very great literary merit in the verses, nor that he had overlooked the incorrectness of the spelling, but here was a proof that the boy had begun to think for himself, and to form and to express his own judgments. That father did right to be glad, for that is the road where begins the real literary appreciation that will come later and that may in time appreciate the sublime mystery of Shakespeare, and the stately sublimity of Dante, and the sweet spring-like freshness of Homer and, best of all, the unap-

proachable majesty and grandeur of the Bible. It was this joy (and here we must speak with great reverence) that Jesus had when, at Caesarea Philippi, he saw proof that Peter had made his own observations, and under divine guidance had reached his own conviction that Jesus was the Messiah. When, therefore, Saul acquired this power, he had received one of the greatest gifts that his distinguished teacher could bestow, and one of which he gave a brilliant account when he became Paul the Apostle.

If there were time it would be profitable to go over all these six points in detail and prove how Gamaliel's training of Saul the student came out in the work of Paul the Apostle. But we cannot do that, and it is perhaps not very necessary that we should do that in any case, for your own minds will already have anticipated most of what might be said—about Paul's power to use exegesis in setting forth the real meaning of the Old Testament—about his ability to reconstruct a magnificent system of doctrine with Jesus Christ as the center—about his grasp of history and his brilliant generalizations in proving the place and the divine origin of the Gospel as indicated in the drift of both Hebrew history and of Gentile history—about his practical power to express ideas and to approach living men and to understand the real movements of his own times—about his ability to see the really important—and about his power to think for himself and to look at God's truth through his own eyes. If we have once grasped the real significance of this we shall have no difficulty in admitting Christianity's great debt to higher learning, through the apostle whose influence on the statement and on the propagation of the Gospel has, as we have already seen, been so very great. And if we accept these arguments, as we appear compelled to do, we shall be convinced that consecrated scholarship in Christian work is not a concession to the spirit of an age, but that it has rather been from the first one of God's most honored instruments for the bringing in of the Kingdom of his love.

We should perhaps take time to point out that the general lines in which Gamaliel directed the education of Saul of Tarsus, are the very lines that we are still following in the training

that we of today are seeking to give to our students for the ministry. For success here does not consist in discovering some absolutely new method of training, but rather in applying to each succeeding age the old principles. Our only original work lies in seeing the new modifications that these old principles need in our own times. We are still giving training in exegesis; we are still teaching systematic doctrine and the philosophic principles that it involves; we are still instructing our students in the history of God's dealings with men; we are still seeking to show how practically to apply and express knowledge and how to approach and influence men; we still seek to train our men to see what is really important, and we are still earnestly striving to lead our students to look at truth and at life through their own eyes.

You will perhaps permit me in closing to make a brief application of these principles which we trust have been established. There are probably three classes of people represented here this evening to whom this subject is interesting.

To students, whether those who are technically called by that name or those of us who are professors, it must be clear, if our argument has been sound, that our work is not an impertinence nor an indulgence of mere selfish tastes, but rather a most important part of God's purpose for us. To young men who see and feel the need of the great world, it may often seem like a waste of time to spend months and years in pursuing thoughts in books and in class-rooms when we might be out fishing for men. But, believe me, young men, there is no part of your life that is more distinctly in God's purpose for you than the days of your quiet, patient and persistent pursuit of truth, if you spend those days in prayerfulness and in the fear of the Lord.

To pastors, one who well knows how busy a pastor's life becomes, may yet venture to point out that the scholarly element that we have been arguing for is not superseded, but is only begun when we enter the pastorate. It is in the actual work of the minister that this scholarly element is meant to have its place and its full scope. We do not waste our time as pastors, but rather husband it when we set apart for each day

or at least for each week a fair portion of time that is sacred to study. For the function of study is not selfishly to rob for itself what should be devoted to the service of others, but rather to multiply the effectiveness and joy of our work by bringing it constantly into touch with that which is really great. What counts is not what we merely do, but what we do well.

There are also here this evening men of affairs and men and women who look from the outside at the minister's life and at the scholarly element in it. Our subject has something for these also. There is no money and there is no effort that is more wisely invested than the money and the effort that are put into the work of an institution like this. For fifty years it has been demonstrating what it can do, and, please God, it will for many times fifty years more continue to do its part in helping to preach effectively the Gospel of the glory of the Son of God. It was fortunate in having for its founders very great men, and now that these mighty and revered fathers have gone, it is still succeeding in drawing to itself others who are leading its work with undiminished vigor and are being crowned with the unabated blessing of our heavenly Father, whose work they are seeking to do and whose approval so conspicuously given is its own sufficient and satisfying reward.

FIFTY YEARS OF OLD TESTAMENT RESEARCH.

BY PROFESSOR W. ROGERS, PH.D., LITT.D., LL.D., DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, MADISON, N. J.

The mighty impulse which Martin Luther gave to the study of the Bible in Germany has swept all over the world, and its momentum increases with the passing of time. He loved the Bible with a noble passion, he translated it, he interpreted it with all the light and learning his age afforded. His bold and independent spirit led him to despise the Epistle of James, and he frankly hated the book of Esther. His very recklessness has a tonic quality, and instead of diminishing intensified interest in the Scriptures. His immediate successors were far behind him in daring, as they were in resource and in power, and small indeed were their contributions to Biblical learning, when measured by the standard which he had set up. But better days were hastening on and a larger learning was sure to find expression when Protestantism had worked out its reckoning and laid its course. For the most part the greatest learning and the profoundest research have been given, and rightly given, to the New Testament, for it is there that our Lord and Savior has been set forth, and we are first of all Christians. But the New Testament could never come to its fulfillment in thought and understanding without the Old, and the day would surely come when a flood-tide of enthusiasm would pour over those splendid books upon whose words, not only the apostles and teachers, but even the Lord himself was nurtured.

That flood-tide arose in our own day. We who now live and work have seen it, with our own eyes, sweeping over all the world. Some have trembled as they looked, fearing lest it sweep away all the old landmarks, not fructifying the land like the floods of the Nile, but destroying it like the spring freshets in the Yangtse Kiang. To the story of the last fifty years of Old Testament research I am asked to invite your attention. I do

it gladly with a glow of enthusiasm, with a great, deep-set confidence that it has all worked out for good. The Old Testament is not less than it was; it is more. It contains no less a revelation of God, but more. More and more evident is its greatness, its uniqueness, its authority over the hearts and minds of men. It is indeed now seen in a light very different from that in which our fathers viewed it. The searching to which it has been subjected has been like fire, which destroys indeed even while it purifies. Many false views of its character, its origin, its meaning adopted uncritically from late Judaism by Christianity have been utterly destroyed, and the sooner this is widely and generally recognized the better. In their destruction I rejoice. They served well enough in their day, but we are come to a new and better day. Our God is leading his people forward, and all the progress in science and literature and art is his. The study of the Bible dare not fall behind the great sciences which have broadened man's view of the world, cleared his cities of desolating pestilences and helped his creatures to a higher life. The Old Testament is in no more danger from the explorations of the most rigid and searching criticism than God's universe from the investigations of astronomy or geology. Your view, or mine, may have to give place to a better; your ignorance, or mine, may have to be supplanted by a richer and wider knowledge. To such discipline as this let us submit not reluctantly and grudgingly, but cheerfully and gladly. Let us indeed not be rash, let us search the new view and prove it by rigid tests, but while we do these things let us put aside timidity. The truth of Almighty God is in no danger, and never has been in any danger. In this spirit I begin my story of the last fifty years of Old Testament research, asking only for a kindly hearing, willing to submit to your judgment all that is said, and just as ready to have you disagree as to agree. I have no desire whatever to persuade you of anything beyond your will.

The fifty years begin in 1859, and in that very year the *History of the People of Israel,* by Heinrich Ewald, was completed. No great period of Old Testament research ever had a nobler beginning. The greatest Orientalist of his day, the

greatest living Hebrew grammarian, had poured the whole fruitage of his life into that one supreme effort. Well might Dean Stanley speak of it in these words: "At that time (1835) Ewald was only known as one of the chief Orientalists of Germany. He had not yet proved himself to be the first Biblical scholar in Europe. But, year by year, he was advancing toward his grand object. To his profound knowledge of the Hebrew language he added, step by step, a knowledge of each stage of the Hebrew literature. These labors on the prophetic and poetic books of the ancient Scriptures culminated in his noble work on the *History of the People of Israel*—as powerful in its general conception as it is saturated with learning down to its minutest details." The tribute is as generous as it is just. The book was indeed based upon a defective criticism of its sources, but it rested upon sound and often brilliant exegesis. It had been preceded by his great work on the prophets (*Die Propheten*), which appeared in 1840, 1841, while the second edition was later to appear in 1867. This book, it has been well said, was "bathed in the peace and sanctity of the spiritual world", and it would be well indeed if its spirit had been more widely diffused among those who practiced and those who opposed the newer critical methods. Ewald had still another great contribution to make in a work which began to appear in 1871 and was not completed in publication until after his death. He gave it the title *"Die Lehre Der Bibel von Gott"*. It was in reality upon Biblical Theology, a subject which now fills a large place in theological thinking, but then was unknown. On May 4, 1875, the great scholar passed away to meet the Lord, whom he had loved, and whom he ever considered the culmination of Israel's history. He had indeed been held by many to be a dangerous heretic, but we see his work in a better perspective now, and have no need to withhold our admiration from his great contribution to Old Testament learning.

While Ewald was busy at Göttingen, the University of Halle had a distinguished Old Testament expert in Hermann Hupfeld, who in 1853, just six years before the beginning of the period which I am now reviewing, published a great work, *The Sources of Genesis and the Mode of their Combination Investi-*

gated Anew. It would be difficult to exaggerate the influence of that book. The world of learning had become familiar with the Jehovist and the Elohist and the Deuteronomist, but the explanation of the manner in which they were composed to form the present book of Genesis was a subject of much dispute. The two regnant theories had been known as the fragmentary and the supplementary. Ewald had smitten the former theory with all his tremendous learning and energy, and it displayed few signs of life afterward. And now Hupfeld, having re-discovered in Genesis a source then called the second Elohist, which Ilgen had previously found, proceeded to show that each of these three sources in Genesis was formerly a separate work. That demonstration made an end of the supplementary theory and the ground was cleared for a larger generalization, for a newer and better theory which Hupfeld had not been able to produce. He had done his work in a fine spirit, his faith in the supernatural was deep and strong, and the older rationalism to which he was born he had left far behind, yet he did not escape persecution. In 1865 he was reported to the Prussian government as "an irreverent critic of the divine revelation", but it is pleasant to remember that the entire theological faculty at Halle supported him, including the saintly Tholuck. In the very next year he passed to his reward.

While Hupfeld was lecturing and writing at Halle, Edward Reuss was professor of Old Testament Theology at Strassburg in Alsace, then a city of France. Reuss had thought long and earnestly upon the Old Testament and had arrived at conclusions so different from all that his predecessors had announced that he dared not publish them. But he set them forth to his students from time to time, and in that wonderful lecture-room they were heard by two young men, K. H. Graf and August Kayser, who gave them a publicity which their author had not dared. The conclusion that Reuss planted in his students' minds came to him, so he said, almost as an intuition. It was startling enough, surely, though he stated it in simple words: "The prophets are earlier than the law, and the Psalms later than both." In 1865 Graf published a book entitled *"Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments,*

zwei historisch-kritische Untersuchungen". That book has revolutionized the discussions of the Old Testament. Men everywhere have been compelled to take a stand for or against its theses. But it would, perhaps, never thus have set the world by the ears if its theses had not found exposition, extension and defense from two men so extraordinary in learning, in insight and in power of generalization as Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen. These two men made the new era.

In 1869 there appeared in Leiden Kuenen's *Godsdienst van Israel,* which came to a second edition in 1887. Meanwhile, in 1876, there had begun a series of papers by Julius Wellhausen on the *Composition des Hexateuchs,* published together in 1885, and in an enlarged form in 1889. Then in 1878 Wellhausen had published his *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels,* a second edition of which was issued in 1883. There is nothing that I can say which could possibly exaggerate the importance of these works of Kuenen and Wellhausen. Whether you agree with them or not, in whole or in part, matters little indeed in some ways, but to go on with Old Testament research without taking heed to them is absolutely impossible. They have filled the whole world with a new discussion. No commentary can be opened without finding some allusion, direct or indirect, to the position which they set forth and defended. Their fundamental thesis is simple enough. They accepted the results which their predecessors had achieved in separating the first six books of the Old Testament into four great original documents known as J. and E., D. and P., and they attempted to prove that they had been produced in the order J., E., D., P., and that the last one was composed during the Babylonian exile. The view of Israel's history which this rearrangement of the sources compels is indeed far different from that which the priests of Jerusalem had taken when the Books of Chronicles were written, and it is small wonder that it awakened doubt in many quarters, stern opposition in others, and heated repudiation in still others. That it has made enormous and astounding headway against all opposition none can deny. It has found acceptance of its main conclusions nearly all over the world, and the opposition to it is now more an opposition to details

such as to the date which it assigns to certain documents, than to its fundamental contentions. There still remains, indeed, a most respectable body of scholars who oppose it root and branch, and fresh opposition to it has lately sprung up among the exponents of the new astral theory of Babylonian and Hebrew religion, to which we must pay attention a little later. Whether it will overcome all opposition remains to be seen, and I shall not venture to enter upon prediction, but it may be regarded as certain, I think, that its mark upon the study of the Old Testament is permanent. No matter how much the theory may be changed by later research, we shall never again go back to the view of the Old Testament which it displaced. Results of permanent importance, of enduring value, have been achieved.

My story has come to the very summit of the great critical movement. I must pass in a moment to quite another phase of research. I pause to pay a passing tribute to two scholars of supreme importance, both of whom at first opposed the Wellhausen theory, and yet both of whom contributed to the advance of criticism, and the extension of Biblical learning. I mean, of course, Franz Delitzsch, professor in the University of Leipzig, and August Dillmann, professor in the University of Berlin, under both of whom it was my great pleasure to study during those halcyon and never-to-be-forgotten days of young manhood. Delitzsch for many years opposed the newer critical theories with all his vast learning, and with amazingly skillful dialectic. His learning, his saintliness, his world-wide reputation as a commentator gave him great influence, especially in the more conservative quarters. When, at last, the assembly of facts, the resistless onward move of the arguments, advanced not only by the great leaders Kuenen and Wellhausen, but by many others who had joined their ranks, and his own studies carried even more profoundly than before, when these bore down his defenses and took the citadel of his noble mind, then many others were convinced because he was, and his very opposition proved the cause and occasion of notable progress. He remained, indeed, unconvinced by many of the more advanced views of some critics, but his very latest books arrayed

him with the critical school. Dillmann early embraced the main contentions of the critical school, but maintained that P. was in the main pre-exile and that a considerable portion of it was very ancient. Reinforced by Baudissin, Strack and Kittel, with Delitzsch, he formed a powerful conservative force, while his commentaries, models alike of learning and lucidity, contributed much to research and even more to the conserving of what had been already attained by their masterly citation of authorities and assembling of material.

I have carried down almost to our own day this fragmentary outline story of one of the great achievements of the human mind. While I pause, and you draw a free breath of relief, let me say again, what I said at the beginning in some other fashion, that the Old Testament, in its real significance, in its own very self, has not suffered one whit in the process. It is better than ever and truer than ever, and more obviously than ever a unique record of God's preparation for his greatest self-revelation to man in the incarnation.

And now, while all these critical inquiries were in progress, the soil of the Oriental world was giving up the long lost memorials of its ancient history. No such rich plunder of written documents in inscription and tablet and monument ever before came out of the earth. It began first in the great valley of the Euphrates and Tigris. In 1820 Claudius James Rich, then resident of the East India Company at Bagdad, journeyed to the vast ruins which covered the site of ancient Babylon and there discovered a few tablets written in strange wedge-shaped characters which no man could read. They were the harbingers of the thousands and tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands of written tablets which were later to come from buried cities all over that great valley. Their discovery cried loudly for the excavation of other cities, and in 1843 Emil Botta began digging in one of the mounds which mark the site of ancient Nineveh, and in 1845 Austin Henry Layard succeeded him and greatly extended the results which he had achieved. From those mounds came tablets both large and small, from which men were to learn the history of kings, some of whom had long been known, while others appeared as

dim shadows against a background of the unknown. But great as the results achieved by Botta and Layard, undoubtedly were others far surpassing them soon to appear. In 1854 Hormuzd Rassam, an Oriental by birth and a disciple of Layard in archaeological investigation, uncovered a vast storehouse of tablets which once formed a part of the library of the last great Assyrian king (Ashurbanipal, 668-626 B. C.). Here was placed at one stroke in our hands a mass of literature undreamed of before. The labors of Grotefend and Rawlinson, first with the ancient Persian and later with the Babylonian, were slowly making possible the decipherment of these cuneiform documents, while Haricks in Ireland and Oppert in France were laying the foundations of Assyrian grammar. That whole story of excavation in Babylonia and Assyria, I verily believe, one of the most romantic stories of human achievement, surpassed in interest by nothing, unless it be the story of the decipherment of those same inscriptions. There is no time here to tell it. I must devote my brief time to showing what it has all meant and how it has increased our knowledge of the Old Testament.

Almost in the very beginnings of Assyriology points of contract with Israel developed. George Smith found upon Assyrian tablets the names of Hebrew kings, and in a very short time followed that up by finding the Babylonian story of the flood, which bore such marked resemblances to the narrative in Genesis that none could doubt that some relationship existed between them. There began a discussion which continues with almost unabated intensity and interest until this present moment.

Soon thereafter the early decipherers produced out of the mass of Assyrian documents inscriptions of Shalmaneser II, King of Assyria, an account of one of his campaigns into the West, in which he claimed a great victory over Ben-Hadad of Damascus, with his allies, and names as one of them Ahab, King of Israel. That one discovery related the history of Israel to the wider history of the ancient Oriental world, and gave men their first real opportunity to grasp its significance as a history among histories. And when, a little later, religious texts from Babylonian mounds began to appear, it slowly

dawned upon the minds of thinking men that the religion of Israel was likewise a religion among religions, and that the problem of its investigation had become enormously complicated, at the same time that it became far more interesting.

But the end of archaeological discovery was not yet, far from it. In 1887, from out of the ruins of the ancient Egyptian city of Akh-n-Aten, came more than 300 inscribed tablets, in the Babylonian language but written by kings, princes and governors in Babylonia and Assyria, and far more wonderful still in Phoenicia, nay, even in Jerusalem itself. When these were read they showed us, as in a magnificent living panorama, the historical background of Canaan before those of the Hebrews who were under the leadership of Moses, had come out of Egypt. And more interesting still, they seemed to show that a people like unto the Hebrews, and apparently of the same stock, whom they called the Khabiri, were already in Palestine before the chosen band of slaves under Joshua had made an entrance into it. Here were new problems, whose investigation is still incomplete.

But even while these discoveries were in the making, men were busily uncovering ancient mounds in Palestine itself. Tell-el-Mutesellim, Gezer, Tell Taannek were giving up their secrets. They yielded, indeed, sadly little which bears *directly* upon Israel's history, but they offered a fine compensation in their rich exhibit of the early life of Canaan. There before our eyes lay exposed the social and religious life of the early Canaanites, among whom Israel had come to dwell. We saw, as never before, the hard and sterile soil upon which the snowy white lily of Israel's glorious faith was to grow. Difficulties indeed have come out of these new finds. We must restudy the whole early progress of Israel's religion, must ask ourselves how it was influenced by the Canaanite ideas, what it adopted and what it refused to adopt—and that is no light task.

And now other questions have arisen which spring out of the effort to relate together the results of textual and historical criticism on the one hand, and the results of excavation and decipherment in Babylonia and in Palestine and in Egypt on the other hand. It would be impossible to exaggerate the im-

portance and the difficulty of these questions. At first, as the flood of inscriptions poured into our lap, men sought to use them for apologetic purposes only. They boldly declared that all these inscriptions proved the historical character of the Old Testament down to its minutest details, and that they swept away the theories of Higher Criticism. From one point of view that was a natural, though it was certainly an erroneous, attitude. The Assyrian inscriptions had indeed elucidated many a dark problem; they had, however, no power to sweep away the assured results of literary analysis. They did not simplify, they complicated the problem. Hugo Winckler in Berlin, assisted by Alfred Jeremias in Leipzig, and other followers have attempted to derive from Babylonia the great fundamental ideas of the Hebrew religion. They have supposed that there existed in very early times in Babylonia an astral theory of the Cosmos, which spread over the whole Orient, involving Israel among the others, and in that cosmical theory they find the roots even of Israel's monotheism and of Israel's attitude to the world. I am frank to say that I do not agree with their conclusions, but I respect their learning and do not delude myself into any false security by supposing that we have seen the end of their theories. On all accounts they must be reckoned with, and deserve to find mention in even so brief a sketch as this.

Other questions beside this great question of monotheism and of Israel's relation to Babylonian thinking concerning God are now forced upon us. The whole vast complex of ideas, which may be grouped under Eschatology, is even at this moment the object of living discussion. Do the Hebrew ideas of the dead, of the judgment, of the everlasting life spring naturally out of the teaching of the prophets? Do the views expressed in Daniel, in the book of Enoch, in the Apocalypse of John, in Baruch, and in the Fourth Book of Ezra really belong to Israel, or are they also a part of a great historico-religious movement? Does the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead come from Persia? Does the figure of anti-Christ descend out of Babylonian creation myths? Wellhausen answers that this is all genuine Hebrew material, but Bousset and Gressman are of quite a different opinion. The matter is not yet threshed out; it is too soon to

decide; but I am personally in this case partially only with Wellhausen, and even a bit more with Gunkel, Gressmann and others.

My task is fulfilled. I have made a rough and hasty survey of fifty splendid years. Oh, how happy I am to have seen the latter portion of these years, to have known personally some of the greatest of these workers, to have shared, alas! in how small a way, in some of their labors. It has been good to be alive amid such scenes of splendid activity.

And what shall I say of the results? Ah, time fails. I can only avow my solemn and personal conviction that it has all worked out for good. I would not belittle the dangers or overlook the accidents that have befallen the faith of some, but in the large view the real truth of God stands surer and safer than ever, and our Lord Jesus Christ is still supreme.

FIFTY YEARS OF NEW TESTAMENT RESEARCH.

BY WILLIAM PARK ARMSTRONG, M.A., PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS IN PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PRINCETON, N. J.

The fifty years which you are celebrating have been years of wide and intensive study of the New Testament, years unusually rich in permanent achievement. Many streams from many sources have poured their contributions into the waters which have their fountain-head in the Christian literature of the first century. The syncretism, not uncommonly thought to be distinctive of this literature, is certainly characteristic of modern New Testament study. Oriental and classical scholars, archaeologists and students of Rabbinical literature have brought the skill of their training and the treasures of their subjects to enrich it. Mr. Allen's recent enumeration of the qualifications of an interpreter of the Gospels reflects the widely inclusive character of New Testament studies, and Dr. Johannes Weiss frankly confesses that the New Testament scholar of today has to do with a field so highly specialized and varied that he not only gratefully receives, but must take at second hand the results of others who labor in cognate fields of investigation.

The horizon of New Testament study has been broadened by the increase in the materials available for the solution of its problems. Manuscripts of the New Testament or of parts of it which have been discovered, fragments of early Christian Literature, the papyri, ostraca, and inscriptions, have advanced directly or indirectly the settling of important textual-critical, linguistic, exegetical and historical questions. The material thus recovered is being organized in convenient form, its value tested and its relations determined by the labors of many scholars. In this way instruments of precision are being forged for the work of investigation.

The achievements of the present, however, have been made possible in no small measure by the labors of past generations. All honor to the men who have laid the foundations upon which we are building: to Kühner and Winer and Buttman for the grammars of Blass and Moulton; to Grimm for Thayer's Lexicon; to Lachmann and Bengel and Griesbach for the texts of Tregelles; Westcott and Hort and Weiss; to the learning of the eighteenth century for the patristic texts.

The Greek text is fundamental to all scientific study of the New Testament, and if the past fifty years had produced nothing save the work of Westcott and Hort, its claim to distinction would be enduring. In the reconstruction of the history of the text and in the formulation of critical principles, Westcott and Hort laid a secure basis upon which subsequent investigation may advance toward an ever increasing approximation to the original text, while the application of their principles has yielded what is still the best available text of the New Testament. Their text was issued, however, without a critical digest of variants and authorities. Tischendorf's text, which is second only to that of Westcott and Hort, supplies this want, and has consequently been (in its eighth edition) for forty years indispensable to independent study. Weiss' text is important rather for result than for method, based as it is on the great uncials to the exclusion of other evidence.

Progress in textual criticism during the period has been due to several things. The discovery of manuscripts has increased the primary evidence on which the text of the New Testament is based. Among these are manuscripts of importance, such as the Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Rossanensis, the Codex Beratinus, the Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus, and most recently the Detroit manuscripts of Mr. Charles Lang Freer. The secondary evidence has been enriched by the discovery of the Sinaitic version of the Gospels, and critical editions of the most important early versions have been issued—the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac, by Burkitt; the Peshitto by Pusey and Gwillaim; the Coptic by Horner; The Vulgate by Wordsworth and White.

Similar work is being done for the patristic writers—for the Latin by the Vienna Academy; for the Greek by the Berlin Academy; and for the Oriental by a number of Roman Catholic scholars.

Increase in materials and in critical editions of the versions and patristic writers has been accompanied by careful studies of different parts of the evidence. This has disclosed important affiliations among certain of the minuscule manuscripts and added confirmation of the principle that knowledge of the history of the text is the condition precedent of textual construction. This work has been stimulated principally by Westcott and Hort's theory of the history of the text and by the broadly planned work of von Soden. The latter involved the association of a large number of scholars with himself, and important contributions from this work have already been made, although its full extent will not be accessible until von Soden's text is published.

Recent discussion of the history of the text has turned chiefly around Westcott and Hort's theory. This theory has been subjected to searching criticism in its three fundamental positions, but it has withstood the testing and given ample proof of its substantial soundness. Victory in the skirmish called forth by their view of the Syrian text was easily won. The battle about the Western text has been more prolonged; but of the issue in principle, whatever the outcome in regard to details, there can be little doubt. The claims for this text that have won their way to wide acceptance do not go beyond Westcott and Hort's account of its characteristics. It is admittedly a very early and a very widely circulated text, and it preserves in some instances—possibly in more instances than Westcott and Hort allowed—the purer line of transmission; but it is still a corrupt text. The able efforts that have been made to vindicate its originality as a consistent text-recension have failed. The origin and character of the text remains indeed an unsolved problem, and it may well be that he who shall discover the key to it will be able to unlock also the problem of the Neutral text. Von Soden's theory of Tatian's influence will scarcely command general consent, for in the pres-

ent uncertainty concerning the original text of the Diatessaron, the key still remains in the hand of a figure but dimly seen, uncertain and mysterious, awaiting the ray that shall illumine the darkness.

The textual battle has of late been waged around the very citadel of Westcott and Hort's theory—the Neutral text. Evidence of different kinds from various sources is tending to connect this text with Egypt, and very naturally the effort is being made to bring its Egyptian origin into connection with Hesychius. But even if this connection should be established and the Neutral text should prove to be only a "local and learned recension", the question of its relative value need not be affected, whatever might be thought of its absolute value.

Discovery has greatly advanced the study of the language of the New Testament. The papyri and ostraca from Egypt have opened a new field for the investigation of the linguistic phenomena of the Graeco-Roman world. The popular language of the first Christian centuries is being recovered and its likeness to the language of the New Testament has become apparent. The latter can no longer be regarded as an isolated phenomenon, but takes its proper place in the historical development of the Greek language. In their zeal for the new material, the efforts of some scholars to rid the New Testament of Hebraisms or Aramaisms is not unnatural, if not entirely convincing. Certainly the results of Deissmann, Thumb and Kretschmer should be compared with the views of Wellhausen, Dalman, Schürer and Zahn. The advance thus made is due chiefly to the labors of Grenfell and Hunt, Wessely, Wilcken, Kenyon, Goodspeed and Deissmann. Mayser has begun a grammar of the papyri; Moulton, in rewriting his father's edition of Winer, is making a new book; Deissmann has written widely on the significance of the papyri; Wilcken began a few years ago the valuable Archive for papyrus study; Thumb has written an able book on the Greek Language in the Hellenistic Age; and Milligan has made a beginning in the application of the new material to exegetical problems. The results of all this work will be garnered in the New Testament grammars and lexicons of the future.

Moulton has begun to do this for the grammar, and Deissmann is gathering materials for a lexicon.

The principles of historico-grammatical exegesis have been wrought into the very structure of New Testament interpretation by H. A. W. Meyer and Bishop Lightfoot. Meyer's commentary has been carried forward in Germany by Dr. Bernhard Weiss and his associates. By its side, but representing different points of view, stand the commentaries of Holtzmann and his associates, of Strack and Zöckler, of Zahn and his associates, and on a more popular plane the work of Johannes Weiss and associates, and of Leitzmann and associates. In England Lightfoot, Alford, Ellicott and Westcott have found successors in Swete, Plummer, Sanday, Mayor, Robinson, Milligan and the Expositor's Greek Testament.

The science of Biblical Theology has received benefit from the progress that has been made in exegetical method. In return it has placed the crown on the labors of detailed interpretation by setting forth in their organic relations the elements which enter into the thought of the different New Testament writers. Not only in the more comprehensive works of Weiss, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Wendt, Jülicher and Titius, but in numerous investigations of concrete problems this science is disclosing in ever greater fullness the richness of New Testament teaching.

Both exegesis and Biblical Theology presuppose knowledge of the relation of the part to the whole in the thought of the individual and in the world of fact and idea in which the individual lived, and for this aspect of New Testament study good helps have been provided. Moulton and Geden's Concordance has taken its place beside Bruder; the great Concordance of the Septuagint by Hatch and Redpath has been completed; the Cambridge edition of the Septaugint has begun to appear and will take its place beside the small but useful edition by Swete, while Helbing and Thackeray have begun grammars of the Septuagint. For Hebrew and Aramaic efficient work has been done by Böttcher, Mandelkern, Kautsch, Siegfried and Stade, Buhl and Brown, Driver and

Briggs. The history of New Testament times has been written with remarkable learning by Schürer, and our knowledge of late Judaism has been increased by the investigations of Weber, Bousset, Baldensperger, Volz, Gressmann and R. H. Charles. We are fortunate also in the possession of critical texts of Josephus and Philo by Niese and by Cohn and Wendland.

Beside these special helps modern scholarship has been strikingly productive of more general works, such as encyclopedias and Bible dictionaries. The periodical literature also has been greatly increased and important series of "Studies" have been organized.

The study of early Christian literature is very closely related to the New Testament. Discoveries in this field have been numerous and important—such as the partial recovery of the Diatessaron of Tatian, of the Gospel and Apocalpse of Peter, the Didache, the Apology of Aristides, parts of I Clement, of II Clement, of Barnabas, of Papias, of the Acts of John, of the Acts of Paul, and the different so-called "Logia" or sayings attributed to Jesus. Time would fail me to enumerate them with any fullness, or even to indicate the extent of the investigation done in this field. Suffice it to make mention of Lightfoot, Zahn, Harnack, Bardenhewer and Ehrhard, and to say that notable advance has been made in our knowledge of the conditions of Christian life and thought in the early Christian centuries. Gain has thus accrued to the New Testament scholar from the better understanding of the influence and use of the New Testament and the esteem in which it was held.

The ultimate interest of New Testament study centers in the truthfulness of the New Testament. All aids to its understanding and all investigation of its origin and character lead up to this fundamental question. If the New Testament be true, then the truth that it contains sustains a unique and intimate relation to the deepest needs of the human spirit. To gather, weigh and test the evidence for the solution of this question is the function of Historical Criticism. And here, more than elsewhere, the subjective element in the study of the New Testa-

ment—the personal equation or point of view—affects most directly the results of different scholars, determined as it usually is, either consciously or unconsciously, by differing philosphical principles. The alternatives of philosophical naturalism—whether Hegelian, evolutionary, monistic or pluralistic—and theistic supernaturalism are just as mutually exclusive and quite as influential today as they were in the days of Celsus, of Strauss or of Baur. When this principal difference in standpoint is neglected or obscured, it not infrequently comes to pass that certain results of Historical Criticism become in the thought of some "assured results", although this assurance may depend directly and solely on a naturalistic point of view. But the Christianity described in the New Testament is supernatural through and through. Opinions may differ as to the truth of such a Christianity, but there can be no doubt about the fact; for this result of Historical Criticism is rendered doubly sure by the agreement of scholars working from the most divergent points of view.

About the middle of the nineteenth century Historical Criticism of the New Testament was dominated by the principles of F. C. Baur and the Tübingen school. But there were already signs of the approaching change. In 1857 Ritschl broke with the views of Baur, and the Ritschlian school soon gained the ascendency. Parallel with this movement in Historical Criticism, the Literary Criticism was being developed, but at present a star has been seen in the East and this is determining the interpretation of the New Testament offered to modern faith by the leaders in the religio-historical method.

The Tübingen school constructed its view of early Christian history around the Apostle Paul as portrayed in the four major epistles. The book of Acts and the other epistles reflected later conditions and possessed only secondary value. With Ritschl the center of interest was shifted from Paul to Jesus and to the central idea of his teaching, the Kingdom of God. In consequence, investigation of the origin and character of the Gospels has been prosecuted with energy; but this in turn has given new meaning and deeper significance to the older question concerning the relation of Paul to Jesus. For as the criti-

cal study of the Gospels has advanced, it has become apparent that the Gospel portraiture is not essentially different from Paul's conception of Jesus. But if the Pauline conception be untrue to the historical Jesus, this Jesus must have differed from the person described in the Gospels. The relation not only of Paul to Jesus, but of the Gospels as well, cannot have been one of continuity. Christianity must have begun its course with a fall, and Paul was not the only sinner. For if, as some represent him, the Apostle "made havoc of the faith both before and after his conversion", it was not the faith of primitive Christianity that he destroyed.

But the critical journey from the Jesus of Paul and the Fourth Gospel back to the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels, and, at length, from the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels back to the historical Jesus is long, difficult and uncertain; and, according to the testimony of those who have made it, disappointing and meager—so meager, in fact, that there are some who deny the existence of such a person, and argue that had he existed he would have been an altogether inadequate cause of the Christian religion. Still others—the consistent eschatologists—see in the historical Jesus a religious enthusiast, dominated by a dogmatic, apocalyptic idea which he received from Judaism, and from which not even his ethical teaching was free. The religio-historical method, with its watchword "syncretism" and its theories of Babylonian, Persian and Hellenic influence, still seeks in general to retain for Jesus a certain religious preëminence after the genesis of the supernatural elements in the Gospel portraiture has been traced to one or another mythological impulse.

On the other hand, the researches of W. M. Ramsay, Zahn, Blass and others have brought to light important confirmations of the trustworthiness of the book of Acts. The Ritschlian scholars have shown more regard for historical evidence than their predecessors, and now acknowledge the genuineness of most of the Pauline epistles. The "backward movement to tradition", in Historical Criticism signalized by Harnack in 1897, has been carried on in his later writings on Luke and Acts, and apparently it is only *a priori*

considerations that prevent an even more consistent position. The evidence for the early origin of the Gospels and for the primitive character of their portraiture of Jesus is being increased. Even the fourth Gospel is finding confidence for some features of its narrative in unexpected quarters.

Progress in New Testament research has thus been manifold and real. Many problems remain; but good instruments for their investigation are at hand. The great central facts and doctrines of the New Testament stand, in their simplicity and grandeur, unshaken before the faith which rests implicitly in God and in his Son our Savior. For, while faith remains true to its Christian character, it will hold firmly—as of its very essence—the supernaturalness of Christianity, which is the chief cause of offence to naturalistic Historical Criticism. And such a faith will find not only ample historical verification, but an inward peace and joy which come to sinful men only from the grace of God our Father in Jesus Christ our Lord.

THE RISE AND PRESENT POSITION OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

BY EDWARD BAGBY POLLARD, PH.D., D.D., PROFESSOR IN CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHESTER, PA.

Biblical Theology may be defined as that branch of theological science which undertakes a historical presentation of the religious teachings contained in the Scriptures. Its method in genetic, historical, and is therefore to be contrasted with Systematic Theology, not only in its more restricted field, but also in the method of its investigation. It is the task of Systematic Theology to construct a well-ordered system of divine truth, calling to its aid not Biblical materials only, but all that nature, science, philosophy, human conscience and experience, as well as religious history, can contribute; in short, everything from every source that may help to better knowledge of God and his ways with man. Biblical Theology, however, deals with the teachings of Scripture. It does not raise the question of their truthfulness. It does not attempt to square them with experience, or philosophy, or primarily even with themselves. Its peculiar task is to study the books of the Bible and to tell in orderly fashion what are the teachings to be found there. The Scriptures themselves are no more a system of truth than a bouquet of flowers is botany, or a heavenly constellation astronomy. The Bible will always be the very richest of sources from which the reverent Christian theologian will draw his materials, but it was never intended to be a systematic treatise upon things divine.

Biblical Theology is to be distinguished from Dogmatics in that the latter includes within its scope such theological teachings as have become the crystalized beliefs of later Christianity, the pronouncements of churches, councils and creeds. The Dogmatic Theologian has been compelled to consider problems which had not and could not have arisen in

days of prophets and apostles, and to construct his system amid situations that grew out of pressing conditions, burning controversies, cumulative experiences—all of which were bound to put a new face upon religious teaching—as the Holy Spirit has been saying many things which not even those nearest the Master were at first able to bear.

Thus it will be seen that, with the exception of Social Ethics, Comparative Religion and Missions and Sunday School Pedagogy, Biblical Theology may be reckoned the youngest of the studies now recognized as parts of theological discipline.

The wealth of possibility which this study opened up was most engaging; for all other streams of Biblical research pour their riches into this one. As the very crown of Biblical study, it draws upon Biblical Introduction; Biblical Philology and Exegesis; Biblical Criticism, both textual and historical; Biblical History and Archaeology—each and all being necessary to the best progress of Biblical Theology.

In turn, it gives back its wealth to the enrichment of all theological studies. As Dr. Schultz, in his masterful work on Old Testament Theology, says: "Biblical Theology is as it were the heart of theological science; which by working upon the original sources, gathers life blood into one great center, in order to pour it back again into the veins, so that the theological life of the existing church may be kept healthy and strong". It is proper first to point out some of the chief forces which gave Biblical Theology birth; and then those which have later helped to shape the course of its development. In this way both its method and its mission to the world of Biblical scholarship may be better understood.

From the earliest days theologians have at least professed to keep well in touch with the sacred writings. The apostles and early Christians searched the Scriptures and appealed to them for confirmation of their preaching; but the disciples were so busy living their religion they had little inclination to investigate the Bible minutely to classify its phenomena.

Soon theologians began to spring up; but their faulty exegesis, their quaint and ingenious allegorizing, though not al-

ways noxious, became rank and luxuriant; their own fancies were read into the Scriptures, rather than the mind of the Spirit out of them. Many of those expounders did not ask what the writers say, but what they might have said had their minds been as fertile and as fantastic as their interpreters'. Instead of the real fruit such theologians brought nothing but leaves. Plainly the day for Biblical Thoelogy was not yet.

With the rise of the papacy, and throughout the Middle Ages, theologians were so absorbed with what the fathers had said, and the saints had suffered, that there was little time for a first-hand, thorough study of the Scriptures. They for the most part had learned little Greek and less Hebrew. Nor had they forgotten the untamed art of allegorizing. Without historical perspective and sound exegesis there can of course be no Biblical Theology. Besides, when men simply took it for granted that the teachings of the church and the teachings of the Bible were identical—for did not the church say so?—when men took it for granted that the confessions and the Bible were in perfect accord—for did not the confessions say so?—there could be no demand for the study of the theology of the Bible. Biblical Theology may be said in a large sense to be a child of the Reformation.

Let us put ourselves back in those days of reform, with its demand for reliance upon the Bible as sufficient guide to faith, and its plea for the right of private judgment. Now, these two pregnant doctrines of Protestantism, with all their value, were quite certain (as indeed thoughtful Romanists predicted) to give birth to a new brood of theological extravagances. The right of private judgment might easily issue in a judgment of the reason, pure and simple, and so lead to rationalism; or the right of private judgment might be altogether a judgment of feelings, and so end in mysticism. Protestantism, to save itself from the fogs of the one and the rocks of the other, beat a retreat from its formal principle (which constitutes the Bible as sole authority) by beginning to formulate authoritative creedal standards. These were private judgment, with a string attached. Thus did Protestantism early begin partially to undo itself. To these aberrations from pure Protestantism

was added the fact that an unduly large amount of scholastic and ecclesiastical luggage had been brought over by the Reformers from their early Roman habitat. So that while the Reformation carried within its bosom the principle of a truly Biblical Theology—its representatives boldly declaring that "the creeds should be interpreted by the Scriptures and not the Scriptures by the creeds"—yet the atmosphere had become surcharged with polemics; men were still under bondage to pronouncements of councils and synods, to traditional views and ecclesiastical dogmas. Hence the Protestant cry, "What does the Bible teach?" became in the mouth of the prevalent scholasticism, "What *ought* the Bible to teach?" Doctrinal disputes biased the mind; and men, having made their creeds, went to the Bible to seek confirmation of their own opinions, and of course brought back from the quest just what they sought. For—

> "This is the Book where each his dogma seeks,
> And this is the Book where each his dogma finds."

It was not till the eighteenth century that a different attitude and method began the work of emancipation. Haymann is said to be the first to use the term Biblical Theology. But his work was really, after all, Biblical Dogmatics. The new era came not from a son of Sarah, but from the camp of the Ishmaelite—those sons of Hagar of the Reformation, the Rationalists. In order to lay hands against the current traditional and confessional theology of the day, writers like Johann Semler, about the middle of the eighteenth century, began to point out wide differences between the theology of the schools and the vital religion of the New Testament. Others followed, Zechariä among the more reverent. It was not till Gabler, about the year 1787, that the historical method of study was insisted upon. Hence he is usually given credit for being the father of Biblical Theology in the modern sense. De Wette followed, about the beginning of the nineteenth century, dividing the field of investigation into periods and including teachings of the Apocrypha and of later Judaism. He, however, did not altogether free himself from dogmatic meth-

ods. Reuss, in his *History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age* (1852), made a contribution to the subject by taking into the account the Jewish religious thought and movements in the midst of which Christ and the apostles taught.

When Ferdinand C. Baur published his theories of the course of development of early Christian thought and literature a new twist was given to Biblical Theology. Beginning with the Hegelian conception of evolution by the interaction of opposites, Baur developed his entire New Testament scheme upon the supposed antagonism between Judaistic and Pauline forces, and the effort at reconciliation between the contending parties. Neander ably combatted this view, and also emphasized the necessity of observing the individual characteristics of the several writers, and then to discover the underlying unity in them all. In this way the study became less mechanical and more vital in character. So in the New Testament, Biblical Theology became something more than the analysis of separate lines or strands of New Testament teaching. The Scripture light came, to be sure, not in one white stream, but as through a prism, by which there could be discerned the play of divine colors, due to difference in time, place and individual characteristics. So the unity in diversity and diversity in the unity were equally recognized. Particularly did Schultz, in his prodigious work on Old Testament Theology, undertake to show how the Biblical religion advanced from the earliest beginnings to its higher, maturer forms, presenting the moral and religious beliefs and ideals considered in themselves and in their living connections as historically two-fold.

There was then an internal development of this study, some writers analysizing the Biblical teachings into various types, as priestly, prophetic, wisdom; some treating the material by periods, as the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, the Prophetic, etc. Then in the New Testament we have Petrine, Pauline, Johannine, etc.

In the Old Testament field, such names as Hengstenberg, Oehler, Ewald, Kuenen, Schultz, might be mentioned in a lengthy list of able writers. In the New, Schmidt, Reuss, Van

Oosterzee, Weiss, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Jülicher and others. Recently there have been few, if any works, attempting to cover the entire field of Old Testament or New Testament Theology. There have been very many treatises upon particular periods and problems like Pfleiderer's *Paulinism,* and Wendt's *The Teaching of Jesus,* in German, and Steven's *Pauline and Johannine Theology,* Brigg's *Messianic Propheey,* and his *Messiah of the Gospels and the Messiah of the Apostles.* E. F. Scott's *The Fourth Gospel,* 1906, and Robert Scott's *The Pauline Epistles,* 1909, might be mentioned among the more recent works by English scholars, covering particular problems. Many smaller volumes have appeared upon the more specific fields of discussions, as Bruce's *Kingdom of God,* covering only the teachings according to the Synoptics, your own Prof. A. T. Robertson's *Teaching of Jesus Concerning God the Father.* These are but samples of the different types. It may be fitting, after this imperfect sketch of the rise and general progress of Biblical Theology, to call attention to some of the more important forces that have been influential in shaping the history of this study.

Enough has already been said to vindicate the fact that the passing of the scholastic method of deduction and the coming of the method of induction made Biblical Theology possible; when the subjectivism of Aristotelian Philosophy yielded to the objective methods of Lord Bacon, the historical mode of study was inevitable. "First get your facts—then draw your conclusions!" Not "Think it out, then place your facts in their proper pigeon holes". It was this change of viewpoint which brought into being all the scientific pursuits of this remarkable age.

Besides the rise of the inductive and historical method of study, we may mention the impulse given to all branches of Biblical learning by the rise and development of the Historical Criticism. Biblical Theology, born about the same time and out of the same forces, drew upon the results of the Higher Criticism, and so there was made possible a more thorough and scientific study of the theology of the Scriptures. Another shaping influence cannot be overlooked. Fifty years ago,

the very same year of the founding of this Seminary (1859), Charles Darwin issued his famous book, *The Origin of the Species.* As the one in the life of Southern Baptists, so the other in the world of thought, was epoch-making. And while the so-called Biblical Theology antedates this work of Darwin by another half century, yet it cannot be questioned that the method of approach which the theory of evolution has given to every modern field of learning has been one of the most important influences in the growth of this and all other modern studies.

Still another force that cannot be forgotten is the rise of the science of Comparative Religion. Once it was quite common among some Christian scholars to despise all the so-called ethnic faiths. Their own religion being true in every particular, all others were false in every particular. Theirs came from God, all the rest from the devil, or at best from the depravity of the human heart. A change began to manifest itself. Nothing seemed more worthy of study than the facts of religion. All phenomena of human life, more particularly those which came from man's propensity to feel after God, if perchance they might find him, were to be required as worthy of careful consideration and earnest study. We studied the ethnic languages, customs, laws, governments, handicraft, why not ethnic faiths?

Another trend should be briefly noticed. The signal awakening of interest in ethical and sociological questions, with its quickening of the social consciousness, has shown itself in this department of Biblical study. Once Biblical Theology gave but scant attention to the ethical teachings of Scripture. Today they hold a prominent place. It remained for comparatively recent students of the Scriptures to perceive that one of the most conspicuous and fundamental teachings of our Lord—if indeed it was not the central doctrine of his message—was that of "The Kingdom of God". Neither Israel's great lawgiver, Moses, nor the spiritual guides, the prophets, made any distinction between ethical and religious duties, and the leading Christian apostle swept away altogether the line of demarkation between the sacred and the secular in the words, "Whatsoever ye do,

whether ye eat or drink, do all to the glory of God". Dr. C. H. Toy, once a professor in this Seminary, emphasized the ethical teachings in his *Judaism and Christianity.* These now hold a much larger place than formerly in most recent discussions. Now all these forces, when brought together, constitute a sufficient explanation of the most marked present tendency in Biblical Theology, namely, the tendency to lose itself in the larger field of the history of religion.

Dr. Broadus used to say, "You really never know anything till you know it historically". The historical method of study will not be abandoned. That there is a historical development of theology within the Scriptures, will not be denied by any sober student of the subject; that much light can be thrown upon Israel's religious life and that of the early Christians by a knowledge of the life of the peoples with whom they came in contact, none will call in question. We have come to realize fully and acknowledge frankly that there is no such thing as two absolutely separate kinds of history, one called sacred and the other profane, any more than there was a double language, one sacred and the other profane. But the serious question confronting Biblical Theology just now is itself a double one: first, whether it will remain theological, and second, whether it will remain Biblical. The name Biblical Theology was never quite a fortunate one, as a name, but the tendency of which we speak goes deeper than that of a name. In the *Encyclopedia Biblica,* the editors, Messrs. Cheyne and Black, say: "With regard to Biblical Theology the editors are not without the hope that they may have helped to pave the way for a more satisfactory treatment of that important subject which is rapidly becoming a history of the movement of religious life and thought within the Jewish and Christian church."

Karl Budde, in an address made when last in this country, proclaimed that theology is already transformed into the history of religion, and is becoming the physiology of religion, or better still, the biology of religion.

Prof. Burton, in an address on "The Problems of New Testament Study", has lately said: "It is a question fairly open to debate, whether it is scientific to recognize a New Testament de-

partment the limits of which are defined in advance by the limits of the canon. . . . . In fact, the principle is already practically conceded. The transformation of the New Testament department from an interpretative and semi-systematic discipline into a distinctly historical study is already well advanced and lacks little but a change of name to complete it." In other words, just as Systematic Theology tends to be absorbed in the larger realm of the philosophy of religion, or into the general field of the science of religion, so Biblical Theology is becoming the history of the religion of Israel and history of early Christianity.

Professor Harnack, in an address delivered on the same occasion as Prof. Burton's, in commenting upon and favoring the same tendency, remarked: "I do not, of course, mean that our faculties of Christian Theology shall be turned into faculties of the General History of Religion; but still I am quite sure that the progress of knowledge depends on observing the connection of both."

This *religionsgeschichtliche* movement, led by such scholars as Gunkel, Bousset and others, is the result of wide researches in the religions of the world, the finding of phenomena in them similar to those in the Hebrew and Christian religions; the tracing of contacts and of influences from without; the discovery of archaeological treasures such as the code of Hamurabi; the study of Hellenic influences upon Jewish and Christian thought, and the like. And this has led to the effort to trace all the various Biblical conceptions to sources in foreign religions, Babylonian, Egyptian, Persian, Greek.

We might mention a few examples of this change of method and viewpoint, e. g., the article of Kantsch in Hastings' fifth volume of his Bible Dictionary, on *The Religion of Israel,* Paul Wernle's *Beginnings of Christianity,* Pfleiderer's *Primitive Christianity,* etc. Bernard Weiss calls his crowning work on New Testament Theology *The Religion of the New Testament.*

While we must concede that there is no isolation in learning, no Chinese wall to be built about the history or the literature of the Bible, and that we never understand thoroughly a seg-

ment unless we have knowledge of the circle of which it is a part; yet it is not difficult to discern the implication of this syncretistic, naturalists viewpoint. It sees in Christianity but one of the many religions of the world. The distinction of the older theologians between natural and revealed religion is set aside. They are all natural or all revealed, as you please. The Bible is the record of certain stages of religious belief among a certain people, a very religious people. It is certainly that. Is it no more than that?

Reuss makes this thoughtful distinction: "Theologians exist only among people who believe in revelation. . . . Paganism and natural religion produce philosophy, not theology." Is Christian theology being paganized, or is it the better discovered by the modern workers in this field? Of course, what Biblical Theology in any particular institution will be will depend upon the man who teaches it, the presuppositions with which he approaches it. I am presenting the fact of certain tendencies that are manifest to all who are acquainted with the present situation as disclosed by the large body of the literature on the subject. One or two other trends should be observed. The modern interest in psychology has undoubtedly had its influence upon this field of study. More scientific efforts have been made to trace the mind of prophets, the apostles and of the Great Teacher himself; to interpret the religious phenomena in the light of modern psychological investigation; finding the central thought or principle of Jesus, of Paul and the rest, and trying to trace the mind in its natural unfoldment.

This fact has tended to remove Biblical Theology still further from the field of Exegetical Theology. There is now a decided loss of interest in the distinctions once made by minute attention to grammar and lexicon. Interpretation becomes a far larger and richer thing, it enters into mind realm of the writer not simply through his moods and tenses, but by tracing the subtler links of his thought; by his silences as well as by his sayings; by distinguishing between the fundamental and the incidental in his thought processes; showing how the central idea of the writer is unfolded; by discussing the relative values the writer puts upon each of his teachings. This is one reason why the re-

cent books are not dry discussions of abstract doctrines, with endless references to dry texts; but speak in terms of personal or vital human relations. They are religious rather than theological.

In the older psychology one looked in on his separate faculties and observed them at work, apparently not thinking much of the one self who was thinking, feeling, acting. The recent works on Biblical Theology are not looking so much at the separate doctrines as doctrines, but are tracing the course of the life which exemplifies these doctrines. The interest shifts from the scholastic to the human and religious. Thus the Biblical writings are being studied as phenomena of human consciousness and experience, rather than of philosophy and doctrine. And we may here quote the frequently repeated remark of Dr. Foster, of Chicago, as an example: "The question is not whether Jesus is as good as God, but whether God is as good as Jesus." The human is to the front; doctrine being the thought-expression of human consciousness, as religion is not God's thought of man, but man's consciousness of God.

Now, this new spirit and viewpoint is already tending to modify the rampant criticism made famous by Graf, Wellhausen, Kuenen and others. There has set in a reaction from the once prevalent wooden method of minute analysis of documents. The scholars in this department are looking more for the living synthesis, instead of the very doubtful and blood-letting analyses. The Biblical writings are not dead bodies for the dissecting table. They are writings with a vital religious message, which can no more be discovered by merely analytic process than you may understand Platonic philosophy by an analysis of the philosopher's brain-cells. It has been "the disease of criticism to be ever resolving into sources or analyzing into parts". Critics are seeing the absurdity of finding dovetailed sentences and paragraphs everywhere, making of a literary production with a distinct religious message a sort of jig-saw puzzle, the like of which was never on land or sea. That there are evidences of compilation in some of the books is generally conceded; but critics will never again play the part of small boys with new jack knives. They will never make the

Bible again a thing of mere shreds and patches. Here the true student of Biblical Theology appears. He will recognize that it is the *message* of the book we seek, not *simply* the origin and growth of its outer shell. The latter is of real value only as it interprets to us the former. There can, of course, be no valid objection to the closest scrutiny of all the sources from which our knowledge of the Christian religion comes. It would be a poor compliment to our faith to take any other attitude. One is said to have asked Leopold von Ranke the secret of his masterly work on the history of the Popes. He replied: "I not only go to the sources, I go behind the sources." Scholars have been going to the sources of the Gospel story and have been going behind the sources. Let them go behind, and through and under and around, and tell us what they find. Only let them, in their zeal and learning, be sympathetic, judicial, candid.

Some of the workers in this department have unfortunately begun their task with presuppositions, which have vitiated and discredited in advance much of their work. They have commenced with an *opinion* eliminative of all that smacks of the supernatural. Too often stupendous conclusions have been made to hang upon a very slender hook. And so it has turned out that a science which began as a protest against the reign of the subjectivism of the scholastic and the mystic, itself fell into the subjectivism of a new scholasticism—that of a subjective criticism and rationalism. This is why the Tübingen *Tendenz* theory is no more—Messrs. Cheyne and Black, as it were, hitting it its final blow in the words: "It is perhaps time that the Bible should cease to be regarded as a store-house of more or less competing systems." (Preface.)

Paul Wernle suggests that "Jesus, above all else, was our Savior from the theologians". We certainly need to be saved from all theologians who approach the Book with any other than a sympathetic and reverent attitude. Prof. Harnack (in the address to which reference has already been made) quotes Grimm as making the fine observation that knowledge has no secrets, or privileged mysteries, but many secrecies; no *Geheimnisse,* but many *Heimlichkeiten.* The Christian religion in

common with all knowledge, indeed preëminently, yields her secrecies to those who love her. The secret of the Lord is still with them that fear him; that possess that fear which is the beginning of wisdom.

Having called attention to certain forces which have influenced the development of Biblical Theology, it may not be amiss to suggest some of the particular questions which seem now to be those engaging most largely the attention of the scholars in this department. New Testament problems are now in the foreground, as Old Testament problems were two or three decades ago. The criticism once given to the older books is now turned upon the new. The first century origin of most of the New Testament books is now quite generally established. But critics are still wrestling with the problem of the earliest sources of our knowledge of Christ and his teachings, in order that we may know what Christ actually taught, as he himself left nothing in writing. Then there is the problem of distinguishing between what Christ said and what admiring disciples who felt the thrill of his inspiring life thought he must have said; or between what Christ really taught and what a generation unable to rid itself of the limitations and prepossessions of the current Jewish theological conceptions read into his words. How much, in fact, did Jesus hold in common with the Jewish views of his day? It is a common observation of even the careful reader of the Gospel of John that it is difficult to tell at times just where Christ's words stop and John's reflections upon them begin. Is something like this true of all the Gospel narratives? Should we say that John read his own thoughts back into the mouth of Jesus, or that John "was more deeply penetrated than the rest with the original spirit and inward form of the teaching of the Master"? Is it possible to detect "those traits and their coloring which betray the idealizing influence of reverence and love"? What was the attitude of Jesus toward the Messianic hope? Did he encourage it or discourage it? Did he believe himself to be the Messiah? What, indeed, was the nature of the fundamental consciousness of Jesus? That of Messiah or that of Son? Son of Man, or Son of God? And what did these expressions mean in his mouth?

Which of the conflicting notions of the Kingdom of God was really his? What were the eschatological teachings of Jesus—if he indeed had any? Further, whose teachings really made the Christianity of the early churches, those of Jesus or of Paul? Indeed, the entire question of Paul's relation to the Christianity of his day is still a live question in Biblical Theology. "Jesus or Paul," says Wrede, "this alternative characterizes at least in part the religious and theological warfare of the present". In short, did Jesus make early Christianity or did early Christianity make Jesus? Or did Paul unmake both Jesus and Christianity? In short, the question of *origins,* both as regards individual productions and also the wider influences of world-thought, is the engaging one.

The question may now be asked, "Has Biblical Theology any further mission now that it tends to lose itself in the larger sea of the history of religion? None will begrudge the contribution Biblical Theology has made or may make to the comparative study of religion; nor will any deprecate the aid it may receive from the study of the history and the science of religion. Yet we are inclined to think Biblical Theology must again find itself if it would fulfill its highest destiny. The answer to the question, has Biblical Theology still a mission, will depend much upon whether one regards the Bible as in any sense authoritative in matters of religion. Has the Bible, as a norm of faith, done its work? Was it, in its entirety, to be like the law—a school-master to bring us to Christ—and that Christ the Christ of Christian consciousness? So some would have us believe.

Allow me to become prophet long enough to predict the return of Biblical Theology to its more distinctive function. It will return greatly strengthened and enriched by that which critical, historical and comparative studies have given her. The last fifty years have not been in vain. A decade or two of foreign travel will not make her an alien. Many inadequate and false conceptions have been left behind and much of real value has become a permanent possession. The tendency to reduce Christianity to the level of other religions by making the similarities loom large will react. For the contrasts will become

all the clearer through the comparison; the vastly richer context of the religion of Jesus Christ will be the more clearly manifest. The teachings of Christianity can never be made the absolute religion by a process of elimination—certainly not by reducing it to that which all religions hold in common, nor by minimizing the permanent values wrapped up in *the historic and personal Christ.* His unique personality will be the great fact which will bring this study again to its own, and establish the Bible as a normative, regulative, conserving force in the development of Christian life and doctrine. "Ye study the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." In a word, Biblical Theology will be Biblical still; and in the best sense, theology still. The science of religion is anthropological, ethnological, sociological, philosophical. This is man reaching up. Theology implies that there is a God who reaches down. Dr. Briggs, in his *Study of the Holy Scriptures,* deprecating the substitution of the history of religion in Bible times for Biblical Theology, says: "Biblical Theology will act as a conserving and reconciling force in the theology of the next century." Not only this, but real Biblical Theology will tend to insure a development of Christianity which shall be not away from, but in accordance with its central historic principles, toward its Founder and not away from him.

And while it will probably always be true that the current philosophy of any age will inevitably influence the theological conceptions of that age—for metaphysics will intrude—the Ritschlians to the contrary notwithstanding—yet in such measure as this study lays stress upon the truly Biblical, it will be a steadying, regulative force in the unfolding of theological opinions. Once Plato bound theology hand and foot. Later, "Aristotle became king in Zion". Biblical Theology has a mission is preventing our being captured by any system of philosophic thought, from becoming Platonian, Aristotelian, Kantian, Hegelian, Darwinian, Ritschlian in turn and nothing long. And we may add, it will make of Christian thought something larger than Calvinism, or Arminianism, or any other theological system as such. It will lay the stress where

the Scriptures lay it, upon the religious facts of life; for theology is of value only as it is true to the truth of life, and as it ministers to the enrichment of life. I may say in this presence that the more recent movements, with all the dangers with which they may be fraught, should eventually minister to the type of religious thought represented by Baptists; for these tendencies have clearly emphasized the truth, that "the Christian religion is not a code of beliefs, nor a mere ecclesiastical organization, it is fundamentally a hope, a redemption, a life".

So Biblical Theology has performed and will perform great service for Christian thought and life. It has already had its part slaying the older method of making theologies by the mere proof-text method. It has emphasized the fact that revelation is not the dead level of a prairie, but a varied stretch of valley, mountain, plain, wooded hill and sky line, with perspective and continuously unfolding vistas. An archaeologist found a modern peasant's hut, constructed of stones, fragments of the ruins of an ancient classic temple. But the hut was not classic, though every stone of it came from a Greek temple. Modern theologies may be made of Scripture fragments and yet be as unscriptural and unchristian as the peasant's hut is removed from likeness to the Parthenon. Biblical Theology has a mission of disclosing the vital, throbbing religious and ethical realities which have made Christianity what it is, and which must continue to nourish it, if it is to abide in power.

In Biblical Theology we have one of the very best correctives of the abuses of criticism; for Biblical Theology discloses the historical unfolding of those redemptive forces which culminate in Jesus Christ. It is the great function of the Bible to present this progressive unfolding. Real Biblical Theology sets itself to the task of disclosing what is temporary and incidental and what is of permanent value in this development. There is a vast difference between the question what is of value in understanding the message of a writer and what of worth in the making of life. The students of theology of the Scriptures will give less time to petty matters of criticism and will emphasize the truly spiritual values. It is of interest to the historian, the archaeologist, the literary critic to know how a writing came to

be what it is; but the theologian, recognizing that he is dealing with writings that are above all things religious, will treat them as such. No analysis of the Biblical writings, no discovery of original sources, can have of itself a religious value. And as Prof. Potter, of Yale, has recently said, "No analysis of the Gospels, no reconstruction of the sources, no critical life of Jesus, no exposition of his teachings, has or can have the religious power that the Gospels themselves possess".

Ultimately Biblical Theology, as indeed every Biblical study, must be tested by the question, Does it help to the appreciation of the *religious* values of the Book? It is just here that modern Biblical investigation has, I think, been weakest. I fear the last fifty years, with all the scientific methods that have been used, have not strengthened the hold of the Bible upon the religious affections, the consciences and characters of the people. The work has been as yet too largely negative. The Bible must be set to the performance of its true function in enriching the moral and spiritual life of the world, or else Bible study is but the scratching of the surface.

Biblical Theology has a debt and a peculiar mission to Protestantism. From the nature of the case it has been chiefly fostered by Protestants. The Bible is its field, and Protestants have regarded the Bible as preëminently the source of their theology. Protestants, too, have had, potentially at least, that historic perspective which is begotten of the belief that in every Christian there is the presence of the living, ever-leading Spirit. But apparently Protestants became distrustful both of the Bible and the living Spirit, and so sought refuge in authoritative creeds, crystalized pronouncements which have often become dead weights upon living spirits. Biblical Theology is still needed to bring Protestantism to its own.

My brethren, there are two tendencies which seem well-nigh indestructible in every age, both of which are fatal to vital religion. One is the tendency to convert religion into a tradition, a crystalized thought form to be received without passionate self-enlistment and to be handed down without addition or subtraction. The other is to sublimate religion into a mere philosophical speculation, or an affectional rhapsody. The latter

evaporates it, as the former petrifies it. When needy men ask for bread, they do not want a stone. When they thirst for the water of life they do not require *vapor.*

THE PRESENT OUTLOOK IN THEOLOGY.

BY PRESIDENT AUGUSTUS H. STRONG, D.D., LL.D., OF THE ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

I am to speak to you of "The Present Outlook in Theology". The theme itself implies that we live in a changeful time, and that we need to define our relation to the movements of thought around us. No one will deny that the ideas of development and evolution have taken fast hold of the modern mind, and have greatly influenced both Biblical and theological investigation. I am inclined to concede much to these views, and to believe that when evolution is regarded as God's ordinary method of revelation, it throws valuable light upon many problems that are otherwise insoluble. A theistic evolution is simply the doctrine that God builds the future upon the past, that later revelations are prepared for by the earlier. As our Lord used to make wine, and took five loaves and two fishes as the basis of his feeding the multitude, so natural law, as far as it will go, is respected in God's communications of knowledge. Truth is gradually communicated, both to the individual and to the race. We receive the divine fulness in installments, "a penny a day" and "grace for grace". God is not shut up to merely external revelation; he can reveal himself within the soul as well as without—"it pleased God to reveal his Son in me", says Paul. God is not shut up to working on isolated individuals; he can move the heart of a whole nation as easily as the heart of its chosen leaders; he makes himself known in history as well as in Scripture. God is not shut up to a single nation as the recipient of his enlightening influences; nowhere has he left himself without a witness; the progress of the race is not a merely naturalistic progress; all real advance in science and philosophy is due to God's teaching. The sunflower reaches upward to the sun, but it is the sun that draws it upward; and it was the Sun of Righteousness, the immanent Christ, who, before the

incarnation as well as after, was God's one and only Revealer, the Way, the Truth and the Life of men.

I therefore feel free to accept all that the Higher Criticism can prove with regard to the origin and development of Scripture and all that modern science can prove with regard to the origin and development of man, believing that this evolution is a theistic evolution, with Christ as its agent and goal. The word evolution, however, has to some minds a sinister sound, as if it necessarily implied a purely automatic and necessary development. While I claim for it a Christian use and meaning, I cannot deny that there are not wanting in our day professedly Christian teachers who so emphasize the element of change in the history of doctrine, that all permanence is virtually denied. Because we are in process of development, both in body and soul, development is regarded as the law of universal being, and is unhesitatingly attributed even to him whom the Scriptures declare to be without variation or shadow of turning. There is no such thing as objective truth, it is said, and both ethical and religious doctrine are impossible, because both are in constant flux. Even Christ and Christianity are held to be merely temporary phases of evolution, and both may be outgrown. Views of this sort seem to me, not necessary correlates, but rather needless exaggerations and inexcusable perversions, of a sober theory of evolution. I maintain that they have no foundation either in reason or in Scripture. I can best depict the present outlook in our seminary instruction, and the dangers that beset our theology, by criticising this mistaken evolutionism, and by showing, in spite of its grain of truth, that it is bad metaphysics, bad ethics and bad theology.

It is bad metaphysics. It is the revival of the Heraclitic philosophy. Heraclitus of Ephesus, who lived five hundred years before Christ, could see nothing in the universe but constant change. He maintained that there is no such thing as permanent being—the only actuality is an everlasting becoming. All things flow, he said. Modern phenomenalists have adopted this philosophy, and have furnished it with a score of illustrations from physical science. The rainbow is no fixed entity, but an ever-changing reflection from successive falling

water-drops. The wave of the sea has no lateral movement—it is simply an alternate elevation and depression of particles that make no advance with the wind which impels them. The musical note has no substantive existence—it is the result of a continuous series of vibrations, and these vibrations are changing at every instant. The flame of the lamp, the growth of the tree, but above all, the continuity of the human body, are all instances of a flux of particles, which makes upon us an impression of permanence, while at the same time the so-called permanence is an illusion, created by our short-sighted imaginations.

And we must grant that this philosophy is plausible, so long as we confine our attention to physical nature. The defect and fault of it is just here—it starts out from physical nature and makes that the rule for the whole world, whereas it ought to start out from the soul of man, which knows and dominates physical nature. In the soul of man we find something abiding. Here is a personal identity, which subsists through change and in spite of change. This personal identity, and not man's changing thoughts or the flux of particles in his body, should give us the key to the physical universe around us. Arguing from ourselves, we can see in the world of nature the operation of intelligence and will, none the less personal because it is regular. The regularities of nature are the activities of a personal being—yes, the habits of God—and all the changes of the world have behind them the presence and power of the unchangeable one.

The Heraclitic philosophy of change is true, only when supplemented by the Eleatic philosophy of permanence. The philosophy of becoming has its little grain of truth; impersonal reality, taken by itself, has nothing in it that is abiding; the plant and the brute are its models, and they are mere successions of varying states. But if we stop here and confine our attention to mere physical things, we shall have a materialism that is exalted to include man and to exclude God; for there is no place in it either for man's personal identity or for God's free will. To save these great interests, we must add to the philosophy of becoming the philosophy of being; we must be

Eleatics as well as Heraclitics. Not all reality is impersonal; noumenal and ontological reality is personal; and personal reality can have varying states and yet remain the same. Even the world of matter needs a permanent conscious self to explain it. Unless there be something abiding, there can be no becoming. The very conception of change, if the change be not capricious and useless, implies a law behind the phenomena, and an end to which the phenomenal process leads. In order to rational progress, this law must be intelligent and benevolent, as it can only be if it is the expression of a righteous mind and will. Nor can any becoming be observed unless there be an abiding intelligence in the observer. Only when I stand on the rock apart from the stream, can I see the rush of the water flowing by. So, in a true metaphysics, becoming is bound up with being. Development? Yes, but there must *be* something to develop; there must be some *law* of development; there must be some *end* to be secured by development. The two ideas, of change on the one hand and of permanence on the other, are as inseparable as the inside and outside of a curve, or as the positive and the negative poles of a magnet. The grievous error of this modern overstatement of evolutionism is that it divorces the phenomenal from the noumenal, makes bodily change a rule for the soul, makes science as vain as the cat's pursuit of its own tail, turns the universe into a medley of accidents, without law and without God.

This philosophy of becoming is bad ethics, as well as bad metaphysics. It gives us the ethics of Pragmatism. It claims that "the true is the expedient in the way of our thinking, as the right is the expedient in the way of our behaving". The conception of an object is simply the conception of its future, its results, its use. There is a grain of truth here. The conception of an object does *include* an awareness of practical consequences. Truth and right have results, and are proved by their results to be truth and right. But the proof of a thing is not the thing itself. The error of Pragmatism is that it regards truth and right as meaning only what we can make by them. It holds that truth and right are simply what works well. An idea is true when it carries with it valuable results.

An act is right which has happy consequences. This is utilitarianism, taking the place in ethics which belongs to objective truth and righteousness. It deprives us of any *standard* of truth or of right, except this, that it makes a difference in practice whether we recognize them or not. It denies that there is any intuitive perception of difference between right and wrong. As the other so-called intuitions are generalizations from experience, so this one is merely a racial calculation of self-interest. Conduct is right because it is useful, not useful because it is right. A great modern authority has told us that Swedenborgianism is materialism, with the nails clinched on the inside. Modern Pragmatism seems to be a survival of such materialism. The right is whatever succeeds in asserting and maintaining itself, which is much the same as saying that might makes right. Conscience is only ripened expediency, and altruism is only egoism perfected. This perverse evolutionism holds that consequences not only *indicate* truth and right, but that they *constitute* truth and right. It is an outgrowth of the sensational philosophy, which holds that as the world consists of sensations, so the soul consists of states of consciousness—thoughts without a thinker, psychology without a soul, a string of beads without any string. Nietzsche and Isben and Bernard Shaw profess this same philosophy, when they say the golden rule is that there is no golden rule.

Ethics of this sort is like the play of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out. To say that right is only a becoming, that it exists only in process, that it consists only in useful moral results, is really to deny that there is any such thing as morality. For our whole moral nature is so constituted that we judge certain acts or states to be right, according as they conform to some previously accepted standard. Belief in the existence of objective right, and in our obligation to do the right is born with us, even though our conceptions of what *is* right may change. The sense of duty is prior to the experience of consequences: we are compelled to decide what we will do in any given case, without waiting to see whether our action will have good results—in fact, doing the right is often required in scorn

of results, as when one tells the truth at cost of contumely, or witnesses for Christ at risk of a martyr's death. Is it said that this, too, is a necessary phase of evolution, and that the fittest survives? I reply that in *moral* evolution it is for each man to determine what *is* fittest; as another has phrased it, we and our ideals are factors, not products, of evolution; will explains evolution, not evolution will; we determine evolution, and evolution does not determine us. In other words, we are persons, and not things; conscious selves, not mere streams of consciousness; free beings, not waifs borne hither and thither on the current of circumstance, as a deterministic philosophy would have it. The Hindu Vivekanmanda indeed regards all of us as mere shifting phases of the infinite, for he said to his Boston audience: "There is not a person in this room; we are not persons." But we know better than this. Back of the stream of consciousness, we know that there is an abiding self; over that abiding self we recognize an unchanging moral law; that unchanging moral law is an expression of the nature of God. We can add to our faith virtue, only because God has called us by his own glory and virtue. "By their fruits ye shall know them," says Christ. But that is very different from making the fruits of virtue to be the only virtue, in Heaven or earth. To make truth and right the mere product of our changing circumstances, identical with the ascertained usefulness of our thinking and action, is to deny that there is any truth or right that has objective and eternal validity, to deprive moral life of its sanctions, and to cut up ethics by the roots. Moral progress is impossible, since there is no definite end to which progress can lead. Unless there is a heavenly perfection as our guide and goal, our efforts after righteousness are as useless as the gyrations of a squirrel in the treadmill of its cage.

This philosophy of becoming is as bad theology as it is bad metaphysics and bad ethics. It is a thorough-going Agnosticism, for it regards all religious ideas as simply creations of man, and as destined in time to be supplanted and to pass away. Here, too, is a grain of truth. There is progress in theology, just as there is in astronomy. But that does not mean that there is change in the objective truth, but only that there is

change in our apprehensions of the truth. Progress in astronomy is not man's creation of new planets; it is man's discovery of planets that were never seen before, or man's bringing to light of relations between them that were never before suspected. So progress in theology is only man's growing knowledge of God's unchanging truth. There are no new planets, and there are no new books of the Bible, but our understanding of both is improving from day to day. Through this progressive understanding of nature and of Scripture the eternal God is revealing himself. There is no danger that two and two will ever make five, in this or in any future world—and why? Because this mathematical intuition is the revelation of a fact in the being of God. That virtue is praiseworthy and vice condemnable, that love is a duty and that selfishness is wrong—these statements are not conclusions of experience or of argument, they are utterances of our moral nature. Conscience in men, declaring that right must be done though the heavens fall, is the reflection of the unchangeable holiness of God. And this is the meaning of Ecclesiastes, when it tells us that "he hath set eternity in their heart".

This unchangeable element in religion, the philosophy of development would abolish. Man, it says, creates his own gods, and his gods like himself must change and die. Man makes God in his own image, and God himself is in an endless process of becoming. It belongs to the very nature of the absolute to grow. The process is wholly internal to the nature of man; God is immanent, but not transcendent. God never speaks, for God is only the growing product of man's intelligence. There is no God who could possibly reveal himself to man; there is no revelation of unchanging and eternal truth; there is no Messiah but man's ever-advancing ideals; the Bible, like the sacred books of India and Persia, represents only the temporary gropings of the human spirit after an ever-flying goal. Christ and Christianity, instead of being a final revelation, may in some distant day be as far behind the times as Judaism now is to us. And so, upon the altar of the merely temporal, is sacrificed all that gives to the temporal its meaning and value—and that is the eternal. God's reaching down to man in incarnation and

atonement gives place to man's vain reaching upward to an impersonal and unknown spirit of the universe, that ever eludes his grasp and yet ever lures him on.

Though an angel from Heaven should preach to us this new Gospel, we must call it an apostasy from the Christian faith. For Christ is the same, yesterday, and today, and forever; and while heaven and earth shall pass away, his words shall not pass away. It is not only an apostasy from the Christian faith, but it is a surrender of even natural religion. Man's intuitions are God's tuitions, and unless we hold to their incontestable authority, we have no God and no certainty of any kind whatever. Truth, beauty, goodness, are meaningless unless there is an immutable standard of truth, beauty, goodness, in God. Unless perfection is something definite and attainable, there can be no striving after it, either in knowledge or in conduct. The Scripture declares that eternal life consists in the knowledge of God, and that, as we now know in part, we shall one day know as we are known. The theory we combat destroys all possibility of such knowledge, and it renders theology as hopeless as the boy's search for the pot of gold at the foot of the rainbow. It destroys all belief in personal responsibility; for without a divine rule of conduct there is no responsibility. It destroys all hope of personal immortality; for without a divine support and goal for the individual life, no personal immortality is conceivable. How different is this doctrine from the teaching of our Lord: "I go to prepare a place for you; because I live, ye shall live also." Nay, how different is it from the teachings of purely natural religion, for that can look up to an unchanging God and can promise rest for the weary soul in him. How sweet and solemn is Edmund Spenser's "Canto of Mutability":

"Then 'gin I think on that which nature said,
Of that same time when no more change shall be,
But steadfast rest of all things, firmly stayed
Upon the pillars of Eternity;
For all that moveth doth in change delight;
But henceforth all shall rest eternally

With him that is the God of Sabaoth hight;
Oh, thou great Sabaoth God, grant me that Sabbath's sight!"

Where does this apostasy from the Christian faith begin, and where does it end? It begins in the refusal to accept Christ's word as law. Knowledge of doctrine depends upon obedience to the truth already revealed. Take Jesus at his word, believe that he is with you alway, pray to him for the teaching and guidance of his Holy Spirit; in other words, take Christ for your Master, and you shall be led into all the truth. Do the advocates of the new theology pray to Jesus? Do they pray at all, with faith in a personal God who hears and answers prayer? Have they not lost the sense of sin and need, which once led them to prostrate themselves at the feet of that ever-living Savior who said: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest"? Have they not failed to take his yoke upon them, and so have failed to learn of him? He would have increased their faith, instead of allowing it to evaporate. He would have shown that the Christ of John's Gospel, with its Logos doctrine and its propitiatory suffering of a divine Savior, is absolutely needed to make intelligible the declarations of the Synoptics; for in the Synoptic Gospels the human Christ bids the whole race of man come to him and take upon them his yoke, claims to be their final judge, promises his own omnipresence with his people, and, in prospect of all this, gives his life as their ransom from guilt and sheds his blood for the remission of their sins.

There *is* a theology of becoming, to which we may justly hold. It is such a becoming as Jesus predicted when he declared that the Holy Spirit would lead his followers into the truth which before resurrection and Pentecost they could not receive. But, instead of such progress toward truth, we are pointed to a backward evolution which does little credit to the theory. Had God so little care for the work of Christ that he suffered it to be misrepresented and perverted, so soon as Jesus died? Here is the absurdity of this exaggerated evolutionism: Forgetting that the historical Christ is not the whole Christ,

and that the Synoptics show us only what he "began to do and to teach", it would ascertain the real truth by going back from Paul and John to the three Gospels. Even then it must purge the narrative of all its supernatural elements, so that it may present to us not a divine Savior, but only a human teacher and example, fallible and imperfect like the rest of us. The virgin-birth of Christ must be denied, even at the expense of Mary's purity, or of the evangelist's veracity. With the new creation of humanity at the birth of Jesus, there disappears all faith in any new birth of the individual Christian under the influence of the Holy Spirit; regeneration and conversion become only names for a gradual development of the powers in religious education. And if we can dispense with a personal God in incarnation and in regeneration, why can we not dispense with a personal God in man's original creation? Neither beginning, middle nor end shall be supernatural. To this pantheistic or atheistic conclusion such philosophy inevitably leads. The personal God, as was said of Auguste Comte's philosophy, is conducted to the frontier, and is bowed out of his universe, with thanks for his provisional services.

This *facilis descensus Averno* is impossible to any who cling to the living Christ. The abyss of skepticism to which this philosophy leads should warn us against taking the first steps in the path of error. The Christ of John's Gospel is required to vindicate the truthfulness of the Synoptics. Only Christ's deity can explain his perfect humanity. The pitiful spectacle of the man who has outgrown Christ, and who picks flaws in his Redeemer, ought to teach us how self-exalting and self-deceiving is sin. Unbelief is progressive and cumulative. The deity and the atonement of Christ are the two towers of the Christian citadel—you cannot hold the outworks when you surrender the citadel to the foe. Education which ignores these fundamentals of the Gospel is not Christian education. The philosophy of mere becoming gives us a false metaphysics, a false ethics and a false theology. Unless there be an abiding reality back of all change, an abiding right back of all action, an abiding deity back of all our conceptions of him, life is but a succession of pictures on the screen, and faith is only the

child's notion that the pictures are reality. Truth and right are possible, because God is truth and right, and can make himself known to his finite creatures. He has made himself known in Jesus Christ. He that is of God hears Christ's words, as Christ utters them in Scripture. The Holy Spirit bears witness to their truth, and in this testimony of the Holy Spirit, as the Reformers taught, we have the final proof of inspiration. These wonderful words of life are self-evidencing, and they are the power of God unto salvation. By his Word and his Spirit, Christ is made to us wisdom and justification and sanctification and redemption. And so the living, personal, present Christ is the interpreter and the guarantee of God's whole revelation. Many things shall be shaken, but he shall abide, Immanuel, God with us. As he is himself the Rock of Ages, he joins unstable man to himself so that they become a rock upon which he can build a church against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.

To him we pray with the poet:

> "O living Will, that shalt endure
> When all that seems shall suffer shock,
> Rise in the spiritual rock,
> Flow through our deeds, and make them pure."

The Christ, who thus speaks to us by his Spirit in Scripture, claims the absolute submission of all men, not, as President Eliot intimates, because he is a deified man, but rather because he is the humanized God, God manifest in the flesh, the atoning and redeeming Deity, the Creator, Upholder, and Governor of the universe, the object of prayer, the Judge of the living and the dead. No mere historic fame and influence are his, but an eternal rulership and an absolute supremacy. No longer *becoming,* as in the days of his earthly life, but *being,* he exercises an unchangeable priesthood, and no man can come to the Father but through him. He who has seen him has seen the Father; all men are to honor the Son as they honor the Father; whosoever denieth the Son hath not the Father. Let us not crucify the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.

Especially let our theological seminaries, founded as they were to train preachers of Christ's Gospel, beware of admitting to places of instruction men who are Heraclitics in metaphysics, Pragmatists in ethics and Agnostics in theology.

May the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary guard that which is committed to it, turning away from the profane babblings and oppositions of the knowledge, which is falsely so called, which some professing have erred concerning the faith.

FIFTY YEARS OF PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

BY ARTHUR S. HOYT, D.D., PROFESSOR IN AUBURN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AUBURN, N. Y.

Speech is the index of the man. The culture of the years comes to life in the fruit of the lips. The voice of the preacher is more than waves of sand; the very personality beats in it; it is the pulse-beat of the soul.

To speak well is the hardest and highest art. To speak so that another will understand, see as you see and feel as you feel, this is the divine law for the propagation of truth. Well said an old philosopher, "He who can speak is a man".

The Gospel is to have the two-fold witness of life and speech. Christ called his disciples to be preachers. He himself is the chief example. The incarnation is the law and authority of the spoken word. The pulpit is the product and index of Christianity. Thomas Goodwin, the Puritan preacher, said that God had but one Son, and he made him a preacher.

Preaching is the chief aim of theological study. We study religion that we may know the essential nature of man and the ways whereby he has expressed his need and thought of God. We study the Old and New Testaments that we may understand and interpret the fullest word of the Father, Christianity as the world religion. We study theology that we may hold Christian truths in an orderly and balanced way. History gives us a true perspective of faith and helps to incarnate the truth progressively in the life of each generation. Social ethics interprets for us the actual conditions of men, the laws of social relation, and directs the Gospel to living issues. All these departments of theological training have their eye on the pulpit. They contribute to the message of the pulpit. They find their voice there. The pulpit is the chief fact and force in the life and progress of the church. It is a teacher of the higher life of the race. All that trains the minister should help to make the pulpit the throne of power.

Homiletics is well called "Practical Theology". The highest truth can never be separable from life. To use the words of Van Oosterzee: "It teaches the minister of the Gospel to apply, and render fruitful in the service of the church of Christ, the knowledge which he has already acquired in the theoretic domain."

It may be well to remind ourselves in a time like this that it is easy unduly to exalt the pulpit and the form of the message. Life has many voices, and the message is always more important than the form, though the message can never be formless. God calls all his prophets, and some of them are taught only in the rugged school of life. Browning's noble words need frequent repetition in the halls of theological learning—

> "It were to be wished the flaws were fewer
> In the earthen vessels holding treasure
> Which lies as safe as in a golden ewer,
> But the main thing is—Does it hold good measure?
> Heaven soon sets right all other matter."

1. The teaching of Homiletics has had special place and influence in America. Nowhere has public speech been more popular or effective. Republics, from Athens to the latest experiment, have called for the orator. The advocacy by men of magnetic personality and persuasive word has been the quickest and surest way to form public opinion and move it to decisive issues. And in our own land, the speaker has had unparalleled opportunity and power. The vital questions involved here of civil and religious liberty, the ideals of personal and social character ever arising from the mingling of races, the spontaneity and versatility and enthusiasm of the "spacious days" of Shakespeare and Elizabeth carried into the open doors of the new world have made the most favorable atmosphere for public speech and called forth and trained many of the "golden mouths". Our public men have largely won their way by speech. Webster and Clay, Stephens and Lincoln, were first of all orators. Emerson likens the influence of Edward Everett over the young men of New England to that of Pericles in

Athens. And the pulpit is both the index and force of every age. The American pulpit has had special opportunities for growth and influence—as well as special difficulties to face. Our people have believed in the pulpit; they have given it unusual honor. In no land, I think, save Scotland, has the preacher so won men and molded men.

And whatever be the adverse forces today, it still remains true that the people with spiritual cravings find their highest joy and profit in the preaching of the Gospel. And so from the first, what to preach and how to preach have been essential questions of education. All the early colleges were founded that "the churches might have a plentiful supply of godly ministers". And the early courses of study were shaped that the minister might have the best training for his work.

And when we became a nation and the world poured in upon us, and the colleges must be shaped to meet the larger life, the theological school was established. In all our seminaries from the first, sacred rhetoric and Pastoral Theology, training for the "cure of souls" had important place. The practical went with the theoretical. They had the eye for the power and responsibility of speech. Unlike many churches in foreign lands, notably England and Germany, where the young minister was left to learn to preach as the dog learns to swim—by being thrown in—we have given careful attention to that enrichment of life and training of the faculties that would give the minister a living message. We have been rich in manuals on preaching, in courses of special lectures in which notable men have spoken from a large experience, and in shining examples of preachers who have set before us high ideals.

2. What were the *leading names* in *Practical Theology* fifty years ago? You will notice that the middle of the last century was a time of critical transition in national thoughts, ways of life, and not least in public speech. It will be no invidious distinction to say that the books on preaching then the most influential were by Dr. Porter of Andover, Dr. Alexander of Princeton, and Dr. Skinner of New York.

The daughter of Dr. Austin Phelps of Andover, the author, Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps Ward, hints that her father had the

department to create. "The literature of the department was so deficient that, at the time he undertook to fill it, the young student was sometimes at his wit's end for the barest materials of construction. A few antiquated text books on rhetoric, and fewer on the art of Homiletics, comprised his external resources." (Austin Phelps, p. 67.)

This is more filial than accurate. Dr. Ebenezer Porter, president of Andover, had lectured to generations of students on preaching, and he may be properly called the father of Practical Theology in America. When he began there were no adequate books on the work of preaching. The best thing that he could get was a small book of dialogues by Fenelon, Claude's essay on preaching and a few lectures by Blair and Campbell. He handed to his successor his full lectures on Homiletics. At the same time, Dr. J. W. Alexander, of Princeton, while placing emphasis on other subjects, was a vitalizing force for preaching both by word and example. Dr. Thomas H. Skinner, of Union Seminary, had translated and revised for American students the notable *Theory of Preaching,* by Prof. Vinet, of Switzerland. And Dr. William G. T. Shedd, while a young professor of Homiletics at Auburn, had put his literary and philosophical gifts to the task of showing that eloquence was essentially ethical and not aesthetic. And his lectures on Homiletical and Pastoral Theology, published long after, are still in use in more than one class room, while his Theology is only opened by the special student.

The books of fifty years ago served their generation. If they have fallen on sleep, it is no evidence that they failed of life. The sermon can never be a fixed form if it is a living message. It must vary with the experience of truth, the natures of men and the special conditions of the age. The sermon is the mirror of popular speech. No doubt Edward Everett was the ideal of the day, in the fullness and finish of his classic periods. And the books of fifty years ago that taught men how to preach dwelt more on the perfection of form than the making of a man. And sermons were often formal and theological, stately orations that seem to our taste artificial and unreal.

3. Fifty years ago there were forces making for a more vital and personal speech. Scientific thought was demanding deeper reality, bringing its vigorous and wholesome criticism upon style, asking that speech should be true to the idea, its very form and color. Wider culture was bringing simpler taste, the truthfulness of nature into speech, something of the combined clearness and mystery of her ever-changing, growing life.

And there were great questions of religion and society that deeply moved the hearts and consciences of men. They had profound convictions, and they spoke them with that intense earnestness that takes the nearest way to its mark. It was significant of the sensitiveness and prescience of your own Dr. Broadus, then in the early manhood of the preacher, that he did not follow the fashion of the then popular orators and preachers of the South, but the conversational style of a Lincoln, simple and flexible and virile. The old order of speech had its last day at Gettysburg in the person of Everett. It passed before the immortal pathos and simplicity of a Lincoln.

4. *The Teachers of the Fifty Years.* In trying to estimate and give one place to the teachers of Practical Theology for the last half century, two names easily stand forth—they are on all your lips—one the son of Virginia, the other the child of Puritan New England, *John A. Broadus* and *Austin Phelps.*

I hesitate to speak of perhaps the most gifted teacher of Homiletics during the half century, in the Seminary made possible largely by his devoted, heroic life, and enriched by his gracious presence and inspiring teaching. I never saw the face aglow with the message, nor felt the spell of his noble and persuasive utterance. Many of you knew him as father and brother. Many of you owe your souls to him. But I have no choice in the matter. My subject demands an estimate of his life and work.

Dr. Broadus and Dr. Phelps, so unlike in nature, early training and public service, have many points in common. Both illustrate the triumph of a consecrated will over physical frailty. Both brought a thorough and versatile scholarship into their rhetorical training. They were alike in exalting the

pulpit above every other work and left the active pastorate for the professor's chair with pathetic and life-long regret. And they were alike in devotion to their Seminary and to teaching. Calls constant and loud could never change them. They were examples of the power of continuous vocation. Having put their hands to the plow, they never turned back.

Dr. Broadus was a rich and many-sided personality. And no doubt his friends are right in speaking of him as having a touch of genius. He was sensitive to beauty, of person, of nature, of art and of truth. He had the combined vision and feeling of a poet that interpreted truth and life through the imagination and spoke to the heart. His humanity was shown in love of friends and place and cause. His intellectual breadth and hunger gave him an interest in every higher realm of thought and an endless intellectual enrichment. He united mental concentration with moral singleness that gave depth and solidity and fidelity to his tasks. There is no finer example in the history of American teaching of the sense of high tasks related to the worth of human life than Dr. Broadus giving the rich and suggestive lectures (afterwards published in *The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*) to a class of one student, and he a blind man. His very nature and the circumstances of his work demanded free speaking, and he became a prince of extemporaneous preachers. First and greatest was the teaching of example. The man was greater than his theory. The foremost teacher of his church was the thought of many. And men who often heard his word and felt his power held that he lost little in comparison with Spurgeon and Alexander Maclaren.

It was a great blessing to the pulpit and to his classes that he who spoke so freely prepared so carefully. He has been rarely equaled for the union of scholarship and persuasive speech. He was a teacher of the New Testament and of preaching, the matchless complement of gifts and work. "He taught when he preached, and he preached when he taught." "He was ever on his guard against shallowness; he abhorred the fatal facility of utterance." And this is the lesson of his life and the influence of his books, to make the sermon a full

and Scriptural message, its oral form simply the best way of speaking the great word.

If Dr. Broadus stood for the thoughtfulness of the extemporaneous sermon, Dr. Phelps represented the perfection of the written form. His artistic sense regarded lack of finish as lack of fidelity. He had such a sense of the dignity and worth of words that he could not come before men with careless speech. Every thought and word must be truly wrought. He took infinite pains with common tasks. He brought the taste and riches of a wide and varied culture to the use of the humblest student. Was there ever such zeal to make work perfect! Were lectures ever rewritten with such sustained enthusiasm! Was there ever a greater desire to awaken and train men to their very best! He never took the easiest way of help. He gave himself in his teaching with the costliest giving. He won the universal reverence and love of his pupils. There was a seriousness of thought and elation of spirit that made the class room electric. Nobody went to sleep there. "Pens ran fast over those old note books. Now and then the eyes of the writers lift themselves to take treasured glimpses of the professor's face; and other notes than the student's scrawl are carried away to help a man in the long battle, for which he needs all that he can get of other things than mere instruction in the science of his art." (Austin Phelps, 71.) Dr. Phelps was the great teacher of what Dr. John Watson calls "a becoming dress for the message of God".

This sketch of Practical Theology would not be complete without the mention, at least, of other names: Dr. Herrick Johnson, professor-emeritus of McCormick Seminary, Chicago, preacher and homilete, keen critic and kindly-hearted friend, who gave his students something of his own great faith in preaching, who has recently put the best thought of a busy life into *The Ideal Preacher.* The late Dr. Thomas Harwood Pattison, of Rochester, the alert, versatile, enthusiastic preacher and lecturer, whose *Making of the Sermon* is rich in practical suggestiveness and the wisdom of the finest minds. Prof. Lewis O. Brastow, of Yale, who has given us *Representative Preachers* and the *Modern Pulpit,* both valuable studies

for the preacher who would be the master of his art. And Dr. Dargan, lately of your own Seminary, with his careful and critical *History of Preaching.*

The half century has been rich in the many who have taught well, who have written on living hearts, though they may have added little to the literature of Practical Theology. Books are not the test of a teacher's worth.

For thirty-seven years the Lyman Beecher lectures on preaching have been given at Yale, named after one of the most striking and forceful figures of the American pulpit. It is needless to say that they offer us the practical wisdom and personal inspiration of the most gifted men of Great Britain and America. To read the yearly Yale lectures on preaching is to hold before the mind the highest ideal of the time.

And the fifty years have seen prophetic men in the pulpit, who have added to our knowledge of the truth and to the spiritual power of Christianity. *Spurgeon,* with his sturdy and homely Saxon, his profound knowledge of human life, his matchless exhaltation of the Cross. *Liddon,* concentrating his long years of Biblical and philosophical knowledge on the pulpit's defense of truth. *Maclaren,* the interpreter of the Scriptures, speaking with all the certitude of an apostle. *Bushnell,* interpreting the Gospel by a growing experience and applying it to life with the tragic power of a great drama. *Beecher,* with great heart and fervent imagination voicing anew the ethical life of the Gospel. *Phillips Brooks,* God's best gift to our generation, expressing the essentialness of Christianity, and with largeness of nature and splendor of speech showing men the glory of Sonship.

Such teaching and such examples have helped to make the pulpit of our day. Whatever the weakness or discordant voices, it is a pulpit individual and laborious, inventive and versatile; perhaps with few commanding voices, but with more humanness and reality and moral idealism than ever before.

Others have labored and we have entered into their labors. The work is unfinished.

> "The new age stands as yet
> Half built against the sky."

What shall be our teaching of Practical Theology? What shall be the man we have in mind as we do our work?

The New Homiletics must aim at a *Scriptural* and *instructive* pulpit, sincere and thorough in its interpretation of truth, reverent and fearless, working for a sane, wholesome, spiritual, progressive Christianity.

It must recognize the ever-living Spirit, that God is really in his world of nature and of human life, that the new materials of biology, psychology, sociology, are his word to be understood with the mind of Christ, to throw new light upon man and his redemption, and to give the message of the pulpit a diviner adaptation and power toward the making of a new man and a new world. A catholic doctrine, a disciplined and devoted manhood, the simplicity of Christ and the simplicity of life and speech; a nobler facility and power of teaching, inspiring, leading; of giving to this critical, sensuous, eager, restless age the spiritual eye, the sense of the presence of God, of his moral majesty and eternal compassion.

SONNETS FOR THE SEMINARY JUBILEE.

BY ELLA BROADUS ROBERTSON.

I.—THE STRUGGLE.

Mother beloved of many a glorious son,
Thyself wast nurtured by Adversity,
While the proud land that fain had cherished thee
Lay stricken, desolate and all undone.
But that rough nurse made thee her very own,
Trained thee in love of truth and steadfastness,
In sympathy and in the power to bless,
In courage, while the weary years dragged on.
Heroes there were who gave their own hearts' blood,
Transfused, said boldly: "If this nursling die,
Let us die first"; and some to give thee food
Shared slender cruse and barrel thankfully.
So God made all things work thy highest good,
And thou today art rich in destiny.

II.—THE FOUR LEADERS.

"Bricks, books and brains," a wise man, smiling, said,
"These need all schools—good workmen, shop and tools;
But some spend all for bricks, like very fools,
Have nothing left for books, and then instead
Of brains must sometimes take a wooden head!
Ah, brethren, let us turn the three B's round."
So searched they, prayed they, waited till they found
Four royal spirits, trained for the hour of need;
A Moses, leading through the wilderness;
A David, golden-hearted, versatile;
A Solomon, of philosophic grace;
A Paul, persuading men with ready skill,
In God's good time came bricks and books as well,
From gracious hearts that loved our Israel.

III.—THE SUCCESSION.

As one who saw his master rapt to Heaven
Despairing cried, "Alas for Israel",
Yet caught his mantle, wrought his miracle,
Strong in his spirit faced the new task given,
Broadening the work, quickening the land like leaven,
Till he, too, dying, had been counted long
The nation's chariot and horsemen strong,
So mightily for Jehovah had he striven—
Thus ye who took from weary hands the load,
Shall see their hopes to full fruition brought,
And ye who journey on a brightening road,
Sons of the prophets, ye for whom they wrought,
Speed ye the Kingdom, blest and blessing go:
The fathers dreamed not what your eyes shall know.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY TO THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

BY E. Y. MULLINS, D.D., PRESIDENT SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, LOUISVILLE, KY.

It is perhaps well that I define first the scope of this address. I am not to give a history of the Seminary, nor am I to describe its influence on the religious life of the South and the world as my chief task, although incidentally this must needs in some degree appear in the discussion of my theme. Nor am I undertaking to award praise or credit in exact measure to the noble group of individuals of the first faculty whose lives went into the foundation of the school. This would be an interesting effort if the purpose in view permitted. My undertaking is rather to indicate what is distinctive in the school as compared with other schools. Assuming that it conforms to the prevailing standards of theological education in general, and that it contains the elements required in all schools, I am to show wherein it differs from other schools and what claim it has to uniqueness and originality, or if you will, what is its claim to individuality in the realm of theological education.

The contribution of any seminary to theological education lies, of course, chiefly in the thoroughness and vitality and efficiency with which its work is done rather than in any formal arrangement or external conditions whatsoever. Yet these latter may be significant in manifold ways in their direct or indirect influence upon the former. An architect's plan, of superlative excellence, is no guarantee of a building of the same quality. Yet, if the building possess this quality in material and workmanship, it were exceedingly unfortunate if it have not such a plan to guide in its construction.

The contribution of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary may be stated under three general heads. First, the curri-

culum; second, certain dominant influences which are exhibited in its spirit and work; third, its leading aims and ideals in training men for the ministry. In presenting these considerations in behalf of our school, I trust I will not be misunderstood as undervaluing other schools, nor as being blind to their distinctive features and the excellency of their work. Nor would I be understood as assuming that all seminaries in all environments should be organized on the same principles. Under other conditions, other principles might be necessary for achieving the same general results. I am convinced, however, that the plan of organization of this school is suggestive at many points, and that it embodies some things which are eminently worth while in the effort to fit men for the highest degree of efficiency in the ministry.

First, then, we note the distinctive features of our curriculum. Some of these were foreshadowed by Dr. James P. Boyce in his famous address on the subject, "Three Changes in Theological Institutions", which he delivered at Furman University, Greenville, S. C., on July 30, 1856. Indeed, the ideas contained in this address, more than any other single influence, gave direction in molding the curriculum of the school. I shall not attempt an abstract, even, of this address, but avail myself of the material in it as far as may be needful in sketching the leading feature of our school. Of these features there are five to which I wish to call attention, to-wit: 1. The admission of non-college men to the privileges of the school. 2. The elective principle in the plan of the curriculum. 3. A system of degrees covering accurately the attainments and meeting the conditions involved in the plan of study. 4. Provision for post-graduate courses for more scholarly men. 5. The large place given to the study of the English Bible.

First, the admission of non-college men. This grew out of a number of considerations. For one thing, there were scores and hundreds of non-college men in the Baptist ministry generally, and many of them were doing very efficient work. There were Baptist colleges in practically all the Southern states and a steady pressure was being exerted to deepen the conviction in the minds of our young ministers to avail themselves of college

advantages. But there remained a large number of married men or others who for one reason or another could not attend college, and who sorely needed special training for the ministry. Dr. Boyce was influenced no little in this matter by the views of his revered college president, Dr. Francis Wayland, of Brown University. While a student at Brown, Dr. Boyce obtained from Dr. Wayland suggestions toward the view. In an article in *The Examiner,* of New York, Dr. Wayland refers to existing theological schools as follows:

"If, however, a suggestion in respect to them might be made without presumption, I would ask, could they not be rendered more efficient? By the tables already referred to they graduate annually about one student and a half to each officer of instruction. Could not this proportion be somewhat exceeded? The labor of teaching such classes cannot be oppressive; might not other courses, adapted to other classes of students, be introduced? So long as our seminaries admit none but those who have pursued a collegiate course or its equivalent, their number of students must be small, and the labor of instructors not burdensome. . . . . If it might be done without offense, I would ask, might not more direct effort be exerted to make *preachers?* I say preachers in distinction from philologists, translators, professors, teachers and writers on theology. Other professional schools aim to render men able in the *practice* of their several professions. . . . . Why should not the theological school aim more simply at making good and effective preachers? Men need instruction and practice in the every-day duties of the ministry. They should acquire the power—and it is a great power, —of unwritten, earnest, effective speech."

At all events, Dr. Boyce was thoroughly committed to the principle of admitting the non-college man. At the same time, he was equally committed to the principle of maintaining the highest degree of scholarship, of not lowering the intellectual standards because of this widening of the doors of the school. Indeed, this last named point constituted the real problem of the founders of this Seminary—to maintain high standards and at the same time admit the non-college student. The solution of the problem was found in the construction and adaptation

of the courses of study. This brings me to the second feature selected for emphasis.

That feature is the elective principle. This was indeed a new departure in theological education. By elective principle in this institution we do not mean precisely what is meant by that term in the modern university. There certain electives are offered in addition to certain required studies in order to certain degrees. In this institution all the studies are electives. That is to say, any student may choose any study or number of studies and pursue them in any order he chooses. He may come one year or two or more up to full graduation, and then take a graduate course if he desires. The courses of study are arranged into independent departments or schools, each of which is complete in itself. Originally there were eight of these. If a man took any one of these courses and passed successfully the required examinations and had a class grade which warranted it, a certificate of proficiency in this department was issued to him, even in cases where the student had failed in every department but this one, or in the rare cases where for special reasons only one had been taken, as in the case of a local pastor or others, the certificate of proficiency is granted for acceptable work in a single department. In courses comprising two or more studies, such as the English and Greek in the New Testament and English and Hebrew classes in the Old Testament, the certificate of proficiency in the department was awarded only for successful work in both classes belonging to the department, though separate certificates for the English Bible courses are given also. It thus appears how completely flexible the plan of study became under the operation of the elective principle. A pastor, for example, who desired a year's training, but could not take a full course, might select four or five studies out of the very heart of the curriculum and obtain thus a great addition to his store of theological knowledge.

Prior to the founding of this institution, the elective principle was unknown in theological seminaries, and in only one other American institution had it found place at all. This was the University of Virginia. Dr. John A. Broadus, who came from the University of Virginia to the Seminary, was chiefly

instrumental in giving practical direction to the organization of the courses of study. Of course, in subsequent years the elective principle in greater or less degree has been adopted in many institutions, and its value is now very generally recognized. If anyone desires to see a full statement of the facts as to the relation of the University of Virginia to the elective principle, he is referred to Prof. H. B. Adams' work in the Johns Hopkins series on "Contributions to American Educational History". Prof. Adams' volume is entitled, *Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia.* A complete system of degrees was in due time elaborated which I cannot at present dwell upon, save in the briefest manner. Omitting the stages in the development, I simply point out here that for any one of our four degrees the requirements are about as fixed and definite as in any institution where the elective system is unknown. Thus in a real sense our plan of study combines the best features of both the elective and the required systems. The degree of Th.G., or Graduate in Theology, is awarded for mastery of the English course, embracing all the studies except the language courses and the senior courses in Theology and Church History. The elective degree of Th.B., or Bachelor in Theology, is awarded for mastery of a selected group of English studies and one year each in Greek and Hebrew. The regular full degree is Th.M., Master in Theology, bestowed for a mastery of all the studies in all the courses. A post-graduate degree, Th.D., Doctor in Theology, is conferred for work done after the Th.M. degree has been acquired here or its equivalent elsewhere. This involves the preparation of a thesis exhibiting original research, of not less than 12,000 words, and the mastery of one major and two minor courses of study selected at the option of the student and under the advice of the professors. The minimum grade of proficiency required for graduation in thesis and in major and minor studies is 85 out of a maximum of 100. By means of this Th.D. degree, opportunity is afforded the more scholarly men to pursue independent study and to fit themselves for the work of teaching theology or other pursuits incidental to the ministry which especially enlist the man of unusual attainments in scholarship. In this Seminary

there are at present twenty or more graduate courses of study, including such as Arabic, Aramaic, Assyrian, Coptic, Modern Greek, Patristic Greek, Hymnology, Comparative Religion, Theology, Practical Theology in its various branches, Church History and others.

The other feature which needs to be emphasized as constituting a part of the contribution of this Seminary to theological education is the place accorded in our courses of study to the English Bible. This institution was the pioneer in this matter also. A large number of theological schools have English Bible courses now, but in the majority of them these courses are comparatively recent. Our neighbor and sister institution, the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, was first of the Presbyterian institutions to introduce English Bible courses into its curriculum. These courses with us have from the beginning comprised thorough work in both the Old and New Testaments. These classes are taught by our professors of Hebrew and Greek, who bring to the class room all the technical knowledge and skill in interpretation required for the courses in the original languages. Each of these classes meets three times a week and spends an hour and a half in the class room at each meeting. So that during the first year the student spends nine hours per week in the classes of Old and New Testament English throughout a full session of eight months.

This institution has also within recent years established a full professorship and department of Sunday School Pedagogy and Method. While some work is done in other seminaries in this direction, and in a few a large amount of work is done, I know of none where the Sunday school has been made a free and independent department co-ordinate in rank and dignity with all other departments. Since the above was written, I see an announcement in the papers that the Disciples Bible School at Lexington has raised money for the establishment of a Sunday school chair in that institution.

One question invariably arises in the mind of the thoughtful man when he first becomes acquainted with our plan of study and the fact that we put the college and the non-college man side by side in the same classes, not providing inferior and

easier courses for the latter. How does it work? Can you maintain the standards? Fifty years of experience supplies ample data for the reply. For one thing, the non-college man is not usually a crude youngster, pulled green and shipped to us for seminary consumption. This kind of man we invariably urge to go to college before coming to us, and if he insists upon coming anyway, usually about two weeks of tussle with our courses of study convince him that he misread the providential indications which brought him here. As one of our students expressed it in the revival phrase, he is very soon found on the "mourner's bench, profoundly convicted of his ignorance, and ready to fall down in the dust of repentance and go back home and climb the college hill first". No, the non-college man in our student body is usually the mature pastor who entered the ministry late and who has already learned to use his mind, and he very frequently gives the college man a good race in class grades and general proficiency. The classes in the languages of course are limited to men prepared for these studies, so that no difficulty arises there. In the English classes the standards are not lowered for the less advanced men. These are put upon their mettle to keep up with their fellows who are better trained. A safety valve is provided in cases where the less prepared man finds the usual ticket of studies too difficult for him, in the elective principle. It is open to him at any time to drop a class and concentrate upon fewer studies to make up for inability to carry the larger number of classes with his better trained classmate. As the years pass, moreover, the proportion of college men in the student body steadily increases. At present it is from 85 to 90 per cent. of the total enrollment. This is not due to any desire on our part to keep the non-college men away. It is the result rather of better standards of education and culture among the people, and as a consequence in the ministry.

To many this plan of study seemed strange and inadmissible at first. The idea of allowing a theological student himself some discretion in the matter of choosing his studies was a startling innovation fifty years ago, but it was one in entire accord with what Baptists have ever regarded as a fundamental New Testament conception, soul freedom and opportunity for the free de-

velopment of the individual. Of course this did not commit the school to scholastic chaos or a mere drifting at the mercy of capricious student options. The influence and advice of professors and the ideals and traditions of the school itself have been and are today potent influences in shaping the courses of the various men. It was simply a recognition of the democratic principle which made it possible for the personality of the student to become a factor, under most favorable conditions, in determining his theological course. In the practical operation of the plan, it has been found that there is a high degree of uniformity observed among all students who apply for degrees, in the grouping of studies and in the order in which the various classes are taken. First things come first, and middle things in the middle, and last things last. This is quite a logical outcome even under the voluntary and elective system where men pursue their courses with a view to degrees. At the same time, the complete flexibility of the arrangement of studies allows play for the student's personality, and in particular provides for the man who can come but one session and take a partial course.

The plan of study of this school was an adaptation of theological education to the conditions, and not an effort to adapt conditions to an ideal or theoretical plan. It was a break with tradition which exhibited strong originality of thought and courage. It was a striking out boldly into a new world of theological non-conformity.

I think no one will dispute the soundness of the pedagogy of this course. It was finding the point of vital contact and organizing the courses of study accordingly. The consequences have been manifold—too manifold to be enumerated here. One thing we may mention is the fact that it introduced into our Seminary life and work a principle of flexibility and power of adaptation which has been of incalculable value. Having set out with a dynamic conception rather than with a rigid straight edge in theological method, it has been possible to modify, curtail, expand and reconstruct according to demands and necessities as they have arisen. Whatever may be the abstract merits of the issue between those schools which require

college graduation for admission and those which open their doors to all (and I am not unmindful of the brilliant services of Newton, Rochester and other schools), we have in the foundation of this school and its conduct through fifty years an example of the vitalizing effect of contact at every point with environment.

Dr. Thomas Hume, of North Carolina, writes me as follows: "About eighteen years ago I was at Saratoga Springs and attended the Monday morning meeting of the Interdenominational Preachers' Conference, composed of representative men from every quarter, who were enjoying their summer vacation there. The special matter for the day was a discussion of methods of theological education. Eminent professors took part in it. There was much interest in opposing and defending what was termed the short cut by some of the speakers. Their opponents spoke kindly of the results of some of their earnest work and of the need of it amongst the multitudes that are perishing, but they could listen, they said, to no lowering of the standards of preparation for regular theological seminaries and to very little modification of the methods pursued in them. I made a twenty minutes address, beginning with a pleasant satire of the method pursued in the debate and of the irreconcilableness of their different positions, and asking if there was not 'a better way' in which scholarly aspiration and culture would receive its due, individuality of character and talent would find its opportunity and God, many workmen be trained for the many and varied fields inviting them. Shall I sketch you an ideal in which you may meet, I asked, and I did my best in that impromptu spurt to present our Seminary under that disguise. As I warmed to it, they interrupted me with 'Hear! Hear!!' and other expressions of interest, many of approval. I did not fail to rub into my audience the fact that the fine realization of that ideal was actually to be found in the South and amongst Baptists, that Princeton and University of Virginia men had come together in its successful achievement. I mentioned the great and good men who did it, and remember how Herrick Johnson gallantly interrupted to pay his tribute to Broadus. They were cordial and kind, but I could not help

wondering how learned men, live men, all alike had been 'set in their ways', and had not come to be conscious how history was being made in their own high realm."

It will be proper at this point to indicate at least the titles of the books which have been published by members of the Faculty of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary as a part of the contribution of this body of men to theological education. I note first Dr. J. P. Boyce's *Abstract of Theology.* It was afterwards revised by Dr. F. H. Kerfoot. The books of Dr. John A. Broadus are as follows: *The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons, The History of Preaching, A Harmony of the Gospels, Jesus of Nazareth, A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, A Volume of Sermons and Addresses,* and a *Memoir of Dr. James P. Boyce. The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* has exerted a powerful influence on homiletical teaching in American and European seminaries, and the *Commentary on Matthew* ranks in the group of the few very best works on this subject. Prof. Basil Manly wrote a work entitled *The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration.* Dr. F. H. Kerfoot issued a small work on *Parliamentary Law.* Prof. E. C. Dargan has issued in recent years a notable *History of Preaching,* and has thus provided for a long-felt want. We still hope that, though Dr. Dargan is not now teaching Homiletics, he will add another volume and thus complete this great history. He also issued a book on *Ecclesiology,* a *Commentary on Collosians* in the American Series, and a small volume entitled *The Doctrines of our Faith.* Prof. H. H. Harris delivered a course of lectures on the Gay Foundation in our Seminary, which were published in a small volume. Prof. W. H. Whitsitt has issued two volumes, *The Disciples of Christ,* and *A Question in Baptist History.* Prof. J. R. Sampey has issued a *Syllabus of the Old Testament,* and is the author of a general catalogue of this Seminary covering the first thirty years of its existence. Prof. A. T. Robertson has issued the following works: *Life and Letters of John A. Broadus, Teaching of Jesus Concerning God the Father, Key Words in the Teaching of Jesus, Students' Chronological New Testament, Epochs in the Life of Jesus, Epochs in the Life of Paul.* He has recently issued a *Short Grammar of New Testa-*

ment Greek, which has already been adopted in several theological seminaries. This latter work is to be followed by a large and exhaustive grammar of New Testament Greek. Prof. W. J. McGlothlin has published a *Guide to the Study of Church History,* and has issued a commentary in the American Commentary Series on *Micah, Nahum and Habbakuk.* Prof. W. O. Carver has recently published a work entitled *Missions in the Plan of the Ages,* and *The Baptist Opportunity.* The writer has issued within the last five years a book entitled *Why is Christianity True?* and another entitled *The Axioms of Religion.*

I consider next certain dominant influences which have affected the life and work of the school throughout its history. The first of these I name is the missionary spirit. The Society for Missionary Inquiry arose with and in the school fifty years ago. Faculty and student body are all members. It meets monthly on the first day of each month. No classes are held on that day. Several hours are given to missionary addresses and discussions. Reports are submitted from the various mission Sunday schools, where our students obtain practical training in mission and Sunday school work. It is exceedingly bad form for a student or professor to be absent from this monthly meeting; indeed, it is an unwritten law that none shall be absent. The influence of this Society in leavening the school with the missionary spirit has been of incalculable value.

I referred to the mission work of our students. This also has been a means of emphasizing the practical side in a most effective way.

I think it may also be asserted that the Seminary has fostered certain ideals of preaching which have in very large measure molded and transformed the preaching of the Southern pulpit. Time was when naturalness and directness and simplicity were not conspicuous qualities in our preaching as they are today, certainly in very large sections and in some degree in all parts of the South, as well as elsewhere. The influence of Dr. John A. Broadus, who for thirty-six years taught Homiletics in this school, has been the greatest single factor in producing this result. He taught our ministry that effectiveness

in preaching is compatible with a plain and simple and straightforward style, that in order to stir deeply the religious feelings it is not needful to rend a passion to tatters, and that there are other ways of attracting attention than by splitting the ears of the groundlings. Dr. J. P. Greene, president of William Jewell College, relates the following:

"Two religious traveling men told me that they could always tell a Louisville man. Wherever they spent a Sunday they hunted up the Baptist church. Before the preaching had proceeded ten minutes they declared they could tell whether the preacher was a Louisville man or not. I asked them why, and both gave the same reason. First, that the sermon was simple and direct; second, that it was always Gospel. I think that this is a good witness and a true one. Both of these men are intelligent and earnest Christians."

What has been said by no means exhausts the record of the influences emanating from this place and affecting profoundly the life of the people through the ministry. I have sought rather to indicate, and that in the briefest manner possible, those distinguishing features which are in an especial manner characteristic of the school.

In closing I consider very briefly the leading aims and ideals underlying the work of the Seminary, so far as these have not been indicated in the preceding remarks. Under this head I enumerate three characteristics: First, the practical interest as distinguished from the merely scholastic; second, the religious as distinguished from the merely intellectual; and third, the missionary as distinguished from the merely ecclesiastical.

From the outset the Seminary was designed to meet a situation. The need was for a species of constructive work as definite as is necessary in building a bridge across a stream, on one side of which is towering rocks and on the other a level plain. That is to say, the concrete conditions determined the nature of the undertaking. To build a theological seminary on conventional lines is comparatively easy. A little sketching of courses of study in the light of precedents may achieve this. But to reconstruct precedents into an organization along with new elements to meet conditions is another matter. The farmer's reply

to his little son's question, "Father, what is the difference between farming and agriculture?" is suggestive. "The difference is this," was the reply, "in order to farming you must have plows and harrows and spades and many other tools. In order to agriculture, all you need is a pencil and piece of paper." Of course, we are not to take this reply too seriously, but it rather graphically suggests the difference between a procedure simply scholastic and a practical undertaking beset with great difficulties. The builders of the school were thoroughly educated men themselves, familiar with the best in theological education, as well as fully equipped in general culture. They were trained in the University of Virginia, in Brown University, in Newton Theological Institution, in Princeton University and Seminary, and other institutions of similar rank. This Seminary takes great pleasure in this fact and rejoices to recognize the influence of all these schools upon its ideals, its methods, its life and work. The founders brought these ideals, and without lowering the intellectual standards, reared an edifice which should gather together great numbers of men of different degrees of preparation and fit them for the leadership of a vast people, widely scattered, who were just then coming to a sense of their unity and common obligation to evangelize the world. The present vast numbers and growing influence, unity and power of Southern Baptists are in no small measure due to the fifty years of service which lie behind us today. There are many thoughtful students of Southern Baptist affairs who do not hesitate to assert that this school has been the greatest single factor in our history in securing the practical and doctrinal unity of Southern Baptists.

I note next the religious as distinguished from the merely intellectual interest in the life and genius of the school. From the outset it has been recognized that religion has its own unique place, its own sphere and its own rights among human interests, and that theological education may easily go astray by a failure to recognize this fundamental fact. We must of course never forget the obligation we owe to science. We must forever guard religion against formalism and theology against mere tradition and scholasticism. The stereotyping process is

a real danger which must be overcome through another that is vitalizing and emancipating. This is a form of intellectualism which every theological school needs to avoid. But in our day, perhaps the chief danger is in the other direction. Religion is primarily not an adjustment to thought, but an adjustment to life. It is altogether possible to define and expound religious truth in a manner which conceives the task as that of adjustment to thought merely. You can economize theology at every point around the conception of scientific methods and ideals until its practical religious value is near the zero point. This leaves theology so indeterminate that it is of little value save as a nucleus around which thought can move and dialectic find play after the manner of philosophical theories and scientific hypotheses.

In this connection I quote a few sentences from Prof. Gross Alexander, of Nashville, Tenn., in a recent article in the *Methodist Quarterly,* reviewing our Prof. Robertson's recently issued Grammar of New Testament Greek. Dr. Alexander was a number of years a teacher of students for the ministry. Referring to a certain type of seminary, he says:

"It will seem a hard saying, but being painfully convinced that it is true and that somebody ought to say it, I venture to say that some of our theological seminaries are the most unfit places to fit men for the preaching of the Gospel and the delicate work of the ministry, and the fittest places to unfit them for it, on the face of the earth. Men have gone into some of these seminaries believers and come out skeptics. Men have gone into them spiritually strong and come out spiritual paralytics. Men have gone into them with an eager enthusiasm for the work of the ministry and have come out as limp and good-for-nothing as a dish-rag."

Finally, I observe that the missionary spirit as distinguished from the merely ecclesiastical has been a characteristic of the school. There have been three great passions in the history of Christianity. The passion for the truth, the passion for the church and the passion for men. All of these are legitimate and necessary when held with due proportion of emphasis and mutual adjustment. The over-emphasis of the conception of

the church led in the Middle Ages to the vast ecclesiastical system known as Romanism. Over-emphasis of the truth as an ideal, as a doctrinal conception merely, created the Inquisition and produced the vast and sometimes sterile systems of scholastic theology. Over-emphasis of the mere passion for humanity may result in a theological vagueness and a disintegration of the church wholly disastrous. It remains true, however, that the aim of the ministry and the truth and the church, in their relations to this world, is the salvation of men. The aim here has been and is to foster this great conception. No form of Christianity is more barren than that which exalts ecclesiastical forms into the highest place, unless it is the other form which intellectualizes away all the vital religious power theology may possess. The ecclesiastical spirit seeks to save the church; the scholastic spirit seeks to save logic; the missionary spirit seeks to save men. Let me state it comprehensively: The truth as a means of affecting the profoundest of all life adjustments, the religious adjustment of man to God; the church as the appointed instrument and agency for fostering the life and promulgating the truth; the Gospel as the form which religious truth assumes in the revelation of God for effecting the adjustment between God and men; the ministry as messengers to proclaim the truth, and not primarily as apologists for the truth; theology, not as apologetic, but as a body of positive truth to be proclaimed rather than defended; the theological professor, not only and simply as a scholar or dialectician, but as fellow-helper of the truth, the church and the minister; the theological seminary as an organ of the Kingdom of God, responsive to the cry of lost men, sensitive to every form of unrighteousness and forever in deadly revolt against it, entranced by the vision of the coming Kingdom, and suffused with a holy passion to save—this has been, and is, and I pray God ever shall be the ideal of this Seminary. I cannot sum it up better than by saying our aim is the architectural expression in brick and mortar, the intellectual expression in scholarship and class room work, the practical expression in daily living, the spiritual and evangelistic expression in holy longing and desire, of the petition, "Thy Kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven".